DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 738 UD 022 512

AUTHOR	Dorotich, Daniel, Ed.
TITLE	Education and Canadian Multiculturalism: Some Problems and Some Solutions. Eighth Yearbook 1981 = Education et Multiculturalisme Canadien: Quelques Problemes et Solutions. Huitieme Annuaire 1981.
INSTITUTION	Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Saskatoon (Saskatchewan).
SPONS AGENCY	Department of the Secretary of State, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	85p.
AVAILABLE FROM	CSSE, 14 Henderson Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1N 7P1 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - General (140) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Acculturation; Bilingualism; Compensatory Education; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnicity; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Language of Instruction; Literature; *Multicultural Education; Official Languages; Political Influences; Program Effectiveness; *Public Policy; *School Role; Social Change; Social Influences
IDENTIFIERS	Australia; *Canada; Great Britain; Israel; National Identity; United States; USSR

ABSTRACT

This yearbook presents a series of articles on Canadian multicultural issues. In the first article, "Panem et Circenses? Ten Years of Multicultural Policy in Canada," Werner Stephan examines criticisms of Canadian multicultural policy and suggests the country has not found a satisfactory answer to what multiculturalism is or should be, or how to implement multicultural policy in a society where cultural interpenetration makes it necessarily multicultural, regardless of government policy. The second article, "Multicultural Education: A Decade of Development," by Keith A. McLeod, analyzes Canadian multicultural policy/programs since 1971, and indicates a shift in emphasis toward a cultural/intercultural approach to enable people to function in a pluralistic society. "Education interculturelle et multiculturalisme: ambiguites et occultations" (written in French), by Michel Laferriere, critically assesses trends in: intercultural, transcultural, or multicultural education. Vandra Lea Masemann examines multicultural education in several countries in "Comparative Perspectives on Multicultural Education," and suggests that currently programs are characterized by cultural fragmentation within a framework of the dominant culture. Sister Ann Leonard, in "Language and Literature in a Multicultural Curriculum" looks at Canadian and world literature as material for developing curricula for teaching literature and language. Finally, Nigel Grant examines multicultural policy and experience of the Soviet Union in "Multiculturalism in the Soviet Union: Problems and Implications of Language and Educational Policy." (Author/MJL)

EDUCATION AND CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM: SOME PROBLEMS AND SOME SOLUTIONS

ED223738
UD 022 512

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Steen B. Eshansen
Canadian Society for the Study of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Canadian Society for the Study of Education — Eighth Yearbook 1981

Published by:

Canadian Society for the Study of Education
Faculty of Education
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
S7N 0W0

© Canadian Society for the Study of Education

ISSN 0315 727X

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This publication has been
supported by a grant from the
office of the Secretary of State, Ottawa

Education and Canadian Multiculturalism:
Some Problems and Some Solutions

EDITOR
Daniel Dorotich, Ph.D.
The University of Saskatchewan

EDITORIAL BOARD
Sonia V. Cipywnyk, M.Phil.
The University of Saskatchewan

Shiu L. Kong, Ph.D.
The University of Toronto

Yeswanth Mahadoo, M.A.
The University of Saskatchewan

Kay Whale, Ed.D.
The University of Saskatchewan

MANAGING EDITOR
David Friesen, Ph.D.
The University of Alberta

DEDICATION

To All People, Big and Little

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Quo Vadis, Multicultural Canada?
An Editorial Comment 1

Panem et Circenses? Ten Years of Multicultural Policy in Canada.
Werner Stephan 3

Multicultural Education: A Decade of Development.
Keith A. McLeod 12

Education interculturelle et multiculturalisme: ambiquïtés et occultations.
Michel Laferrière 27

Comparative Perspectives on Multicultural Education.
Vandra Lea Masemann 38

Language and Literature in a Multicultural Curriculum.
Sister Anne Leonard 49

Multiculturalism in the Soviet Union: Problems and Implications of Language and Educational Policy.
Nigel Grant 60

Biographical Notes — Notes biographiques 76

Quo Vadis, Multicultural Canada?
An Editorial Comment

We the people of the United Nations are determined . . . to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small . . .

Preamble to the Charter of the U.N.

The year 1981 A.D. marks the tenth anniversary of the Prime Minister's declaration in Parliament that Canada is a multicultural country. The current conflict over the Constitution seems to be related to a large extent to the question of entrenchment of human rights, especially minority language rights.

Canadians are smugly aware of the tyranny of dictators in authoritarian and totalitarian countries, but it is easy to forget how oppressive the tyranny of the majority can be. Was it not by the will of the majority that Socrates was put to death in Ancient Greece? And was it not by the will of the mob that lynchings were carried out in Modern America? Today, in the West of Canada, do not majorities on municipal councils often prevent Hutterites from establishing new colonies?

In 1965, at the First Conference on Canadian Slavs, held in Banff, Alberta, I and several other participants, including no less a prominent figure than Senator Paul Yuzik, made public recommendations that the Royal Commission on Bi-lingualism and Bi-culturalism be renamed "Royal Commission on Bi-lingualism and Multi-culturalism." While welcoming the privilege of having two world languages as the official languages of Canada, we insisted that recognition be given to the fact that Canada has many cultures as indicated by the expression "Canadian Mosaic".

Since 1971, federal and provincial policies and practices have given substance to the Prime Minister's declaration affirming the multicultural nature of Canada. However, partly because of the lack of inclusion in the proposed constitutional amendments of minority language rights other than only English and French, and partly for a variety of social and economic reasons, some observers have concluded that the policies of multiculturalism are primarily a political palliative designed to gain electoral support from the nearly one third of Canadians who have neither British nor French roots.

There is ample documentation, in addition to John Porter's classical study *The Vertical Mosaic,* to demonstrate that in Canada "some people are more equal than others." Claims by some Canadians to special status for the so-called "Two Founding Nations" — by which they do not mean the Indians and Inuit, the original inhabitants of this land — deny to about one third of Canadians full linguistic, cultural, social, economic and political rights and opportunities, equal to those reserved for the dominant groups.

What are the causes of the fears of some people from a pluralistic society? Do they dread "Balkanization" of Canada? Do they pretend to be so concerned for the well-being of the minorities that they want to give them a chance to succeed in the dominant society by forcing them to learn the language and to fit into the culture of the majority, rather than letting them do so at their own choice and pace?

Could their apprehensions not be based on a misconception that societies do not evolve and change? Some historians and anthropologists have shown that monistic and unitary cultures are static, and often dreary. Dualistic cultures (i.e., bi-culturalism) tend to be confrontational and full of strife and tension as in Northern Ireland and Belgium. Only pluralistic cultures seem to be invariably dynamic and robustly creative. A multicultural Canada, where all people enjoy equal rights and opportunities for self-expression and self-fulfillment, might become a model for the rest of the world to follow or to be inspired by.

Following the Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations which introduces this preface, equal opportunities, full respect for and appreciation of others ought to be based on social justice and basic human rights rather than political expediency and the mood of the majority. But, first and foremost, at least in my opinion, equal rights and opportunities for all should be a policy and practice unreservedly and genuinely supported by educational institutions at all levels and in all corners of Canada, because that is where the attitudes of the growing generations are shaped to a significant extent.

The original intention of the Comparative and International Education Society of Canada, sponsor of the Eighth Yearbook, was to devote this volume to "Education for Cross-cultural Awareness". However, the papers which were eventually submitted for consideration have all, as if by magic, followed the theme of multiculturalism. And this is just as well, because, as it is, the 1981 Yearbook has become a kind of reflective reassessment of a decade's failures and successes of Canada's multicultural policy.

Whereas the first five papers are directly related to multiculturalism in Canada, Nigel Grant's study of the problems and implications of language and educational policy in the USSR was included to provide a broader comparative perspective to the Yearbook, and to show that Canada is not the only country in this world which has to face problems associated with multiculturalism. In some ways, Canada's problems are minor by comparison with those faced by some other countries. The main task is to know where we want to go: as the Yugoslavs say, "people are the blacksmiths of their own fortune." Today, as Canadians, regardless of when and how we came, we have the opportunity to build a Canada of our dreams and hopes; in short, to make history. As educators, we can play a leading role in this endeavour.

Finally, I would like to give a word of thanks to the members of the Editorial Board, especially to Sonia Cipywnyk and Kay Whale, who have provided me with their assiduous assistance in the meticulous task of editing this yearbook.

Daniel Dorotich, Editor
Saskatoon, February, 1981

Panem et circenses?
Ten Years of Multicultural Policy in Canada

Werner Stephan
University of Saskatchewan

L'année 1981 marque le dixième anniversaire de l'annonce faite par le gouvernement fédéral d'une politique multiculturelle au Canada. Alors que la mise en oeuvre de nouveaux programmes a progressé, des critiques s'élèvent pour protester contre les hypothèses de base, en particulier dans le domaine de l'éducation multiculturelle. Nous examinerons trois des plus récentes critiques; à savoir: premièrement, le sens de l'éducation multiculturelle est confus; deuxièmement, le multiculturalisme détourne virtuellement l'attention du public de sujets plus importants; troisièmement, les écoles sont des institutions inadéquates pour promouvoir, grâce au multiculturalisme, une plus grande égalité sociale.

Il se pose alors la question de savoir si la politique multiculturelle est utilisée comme force pacificatrice qui aide au contrôle social. L'auteur prétend que certains critiques se sont servi d'une notion statique pour le terme "culture" et il soutient que la culture doit être un concept dynamique et désigner le milieu qui permet à l'homme de s'adapter. Dans cette perspective-ci, il considère la société canadienne comme multiculturelle par essence, du fait que les interactions quotidiennes de gens venus d'horizons social et ethnique divers sans cesse modèlent et changent leurs identités culturelles. De plus, l'interpénétration d'influence culturelles nationales et internationales élargit la portée du "milieu d'accomodation". Ainsi l'éducation multiculturelle devient-elle une étape nécessaire pour préparer les étudiants à la vie dans un monde culturellement interdépendant.

If anniversaries serve any purpose at all, it is probably to reflect on accomplishments of the past and to assess the tasks that lie ahead. Official celebrations on those occasions tend to glorify achievements, looking into the future with confidence and optimism. Critical overtones about the celebrated event are very unlikely, since dealing with its more problematic aspects is the domain of 'professionals' who will discuss their concerns outside the public forum in their offices, in scholarly journals, or at esoteric conferences. The pattern of celebration might be followed later this year on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the federal government's pronouncement of a multicultural policy for Canada. But can we be certain that federal government officials, representatives of provincial governments, and spokesmen of ethno-cultural groups will actually address themselves to this event? Is multiculturalism still alive after ten years?

The purpose of this paper is to examine some of the questions that have been raised more recently about the status of multiculturalism and in particular of multicultural education. There is first the question of meaning. What do Canadians in general, and what do Canadian educators in particular mean when they talk about multiculturalism? Perhaps even more pressing is the question, can we afford to pursue the goal of a multicultural society at a time when other social, economic, and political problems or crises require our undivided attention? Is multiculturalism in its present form a pacifier, very much like the practice in ancient Rome of providing bread and entertainment for the masses as a means of social control? In attempting to answer these questions, some of the critics of multiculturalism in education will be consulted. What emerges out of the discussion may be a new point of departure for developing directions for the years ahead.

An optimistic view: New ideas have taken shape since 1971

The point has been made that Canada has a multicultural history that predates 1971 (Palmer, 1975). True as the claim may be, the explicit statement of goals and objectives, and of the extent and procedures for transmitting a multicultural ideology through the schools is new. It owes its inception to the federal government's policy enunciated in October, 1971. Since that time the record of achievements and innovative ideas is quite impressive, considering the almost proverbial tardiness of institutions in responding to new directives. As Burnet (1978) has shown, government positions have been established for developing and coordinating new programs and projects. Public agencies, such as the National Film Board, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, libraries, and archives, have adopted multiculturalism as part of their responsibilities. The four 'inland' provinces from Ontario to Alberta have proclaimed multicultural policies of their own, and have initiated curricula and programs congruent with the stated objectives. But, even in these four provinces, the translation of government policies into classroom practice is a slow process, and language programs emphasize the central position of the two official languages. ESL[1]-classes, important though they are, may even be considered detrimental to multicultural education as long as there is no concurrent program for using the students' ancestral language in their education.

In making multiculturalism a principle of federal policy, the government appears to have set a precedent for other countries that find themselves in similar historical situations. Multi-ethnic nations have existed for centuries, and many different modes of resolving the issues of unity and diversity have been tried, from persecution and even annihilation of minorities to full integration of, or granting autonomous status to them. But the need to accommodate minority groups has become more urgent, as political upheavals and subsequent refugee migrations across the globe create new minority groups in countries which were formerly ethnically 'balanced'. The manpower needs of highly industrialized countries have triggered massive migrations of workers from less developed parts of the world into Western Europe, thereby changing the demographic composition and the ethnic fabric of the host countries. International treaties and supra-national political arrangements that facilitate the exchange of labour across national boundaries, as, for example, in the European Economic Community, challenge the notion of the culturally homogenous nation-state. Such treaties and arrangements accelerate the emergence of multi-ethnic or multicultural societies in many parts of the industrialized world. Comparative research into multicultural education is still at an initial stage (Watson, 1979), and the Canadian response to the problem is watched closely and with great interest, particularly by educators in Europe. At a recent international conference dealing with the issue of multiculturalism in Eastern Europe, three of the five panelists were from Canada.[2]

A realistic view: There are still problems to be resolved

Somebody once described historians as people trying to find answers to questions that nobody asked. Similarly, academics who discuss multicultural education could be accused of wasting their time and other people's money in attempting to clarify an issue that is virtually irrelevant to educational practitioners out in the field. In other words, the question "Is multicultural education feasible?" is superseded in actual classroom situations by

the question "How do I cope with an already overcrowded curriculum?" Does the 'public', do teachers, and do students care about multiculturalism?

Consider the following: since 1971, only four out of ten provincial governments have officially adopted multiculturalism. Yet, even in those provinces, Francophones face difficulties in receiving their entire schooling in the French language; the languages of other ethno-cultural groups, if offered at all, are taught as foreign languages. Natives children still lag behind their 'white' counterparts in educational opportunities, although some progress can be noticed with respect to retention of ancestral language, instruction by native teachers, and curricular content.

Institutional inertia and passive resistance within the administrative structure of the schools has been described by Cipywnyk (1979). To correct the situation, she suggests that "departments of education must not allow the legitimate aspirations of ethno-cultural groups to be scuttled by recalcitrant schoolboards and superintendents' (Cipywnyk, 1979:123-4). As far as public awareness is concerned, Cipywnyk still waits to see a serious commitment on the part of government officials to initiating a campaign for sensitizing the public to the issue of multiculturalism.

Consider further that the federal government's proposed charter of rights, as part of the Constitutional Proposal in 1980, did not even mention multiculturalism. This issue was raised at the 1980 National Meeting of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism in Edmonton. Not only was the vagueness of the federal govenment's position on the 'other' ethnic groups criticized, but there was a call for a ministry of culture, aiming "at ending the distinction between the administration of programs dealing with French-and-English-Canadian culture and those dealing with so-called 'ethnic' cultures" (Cultures Canada, 1980:1). Furthermore, resolutions were submitted, urging the government to use the mass media for promoting multiculturalism, and delegates argued that "government agencies at home and abroad must finally come to reflect the multicultural reality of this country" (Cultures Canada, 1980:6). Only after representatives from major ethnic minority groups appeared before the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Constitutional Change was the government prepared to include in their proposal the notion that the multicultural heritage of the country needs to be preserved.

Finally, how does one interpret the introductory statement in a teachers' guide to ethnic studies (Wood, 1978:1), published by the Ontario Institute for the Study of Education, that "in English Canada, ethnic diversity is no longer seen as a barrier to assimilating all Canadians into the English-Canadian culture"?

A Critical view: Lack of conceptual precision

The question of how to interpret concepts such as assimilation, pluralism, and multiculturalism prompted Young (1979) "to negotiate a path through the 'labyrinth of assertions and assumptions' in order to clarify some of the concepts associated with multiculturalism and multicultural education" (Young, 1979:5). Considering the fact that he found over 300 different definitions of the term 'culture', it comes as no surprise that the concept of multiculturalism cannot be defined in terms that are universally acceptable. The same, of course, applies to multicultural education, and the closest 'model' that Young could identify in the literature is a four-part typology developed by Gibson (1976). Upon closer examination of the four possible approaches, namely Education of the Culturally Different, Education about Cultural Differences, Education for Cultural

Pluralism, and Bi-cultural Education, Young finds that all of them have a bearing on what can be found in Canadian schools under the label of multicultural education.

Although the ambiguity surrounding the notion of multiculturalism could not be removed, Young's conclusions are quite significant. The various interpretations of multicultural education reflect explicitly and implicitly different visions of Canadian society, and, depending upon the way in which politicians, administrators, or school personnel use the term multicultural education, it becomes easier "to distinguish political rhetoric from educational reality" (Young, 1979:18).

Young's conceptual analysis highlights two important points. First, if the decision over the meaning of multicultural education is left to individuals or to interest groups, how can teachers design multicultural programs that are acceptable to the wider community? In other words, how can we ever expect to reach our destination if we do not know which way to go? This point has been made as recently as 1975, when the OECD report on Canadian education specifically pointed out the lack of socio-political goal orientations for our educational institutions. The second point is closely linked to the first. The lack of conceptual clarification appears to be politically quite 'functional' in that it allows all those involved in educational decision making to use the term in their own idiosyncratic way and still feel justified in claiming to provide multicultural education for their constituencies.

While establishing the connection between the various interpretations of multicultural education and diverse visions of society, Young limits his discussion to education as such, leaving aside the effects of the dynamics of social change on what actually happens in schools. The current concern over energy policies, and the federal government's preoccupation with constitutional change have virtually removed the discussion of multicultural issues from public debates. In a similar vein, the opposition's claim of widespread Western alienation, not unlike the earlier threats of Quebec separatism, has shifted the focus of attention from the issue of ethno-cultural diversity to national unity, and from the issue of cultural pluralism to regional pluralism, in the sense of Canada being a 'community of communities'. There can be no doubt that the official status of multiculturalism and of multicultural education is linked to the political scene, much more so than to the policies of departments of education and of school boards.

A second critical view: Lack of political perspective

The linkage of multicultural education to the wider political and social panorama forms the essence of the critique submitted by Mazurek (1979). Drawing on Porter (1975) and Forcese (1975), he questions the utility of the revival of ethnicity because of its divisive character. Mazurek fears that eventually the issue of socio-economic amelioration will become subordinate to 'cultural integrity', and that the democratic principles as they have evolved in this country over the centuries will be negatively affected. In other words, the ideal of multiculturalism is waving the carrot of academic equality and economic redistribution before all cultural groups, while at the same time diverting attention from the real issues of an advanced class society (Mazurek, 1979:33).

Mazurek supports his argument by looking at immigration policies which appear to reinforce social stratification through ethnic stratification. Whereas immigrants from the United Kingdom and from the United States are rarely of working-class background, people of 'other' ethnic backgrounds are usually admitted into Canada to fill low-status

positions. Multicultural education by means of an "ethnicized" curriculum would certainly not affect the distribution of power in society. Mazurek concludes that, "Ethnicity has a price."

> If you are in the 'right' ethnic group, then you have a good chance to avail yourself of the riches our land has to offer. If not, there is the danger that your cultural consciousness may merely be a placebo for social injustice and inequality. (Mazurek, 1979:36)

Another important point in the context of this paper is Mazurek's insistence that in a time of fiscal constraints and of competency-based, skill-oriented education, decision makers will first curtail those parts of educational programs that have little or no relevance for the development of skills. As he found in a recent survey of schools in Ontario (Livingstone, 1978), subjects such as French, History, Political Education, and Science Knowledge have a low curricular priority. Similarly, multiculturalism, he thinks, will be seen as a 'frill', a dispensable item of the curriculum, rather than a readily marketable component of the core curriculum. As a result of his analysis, Mazurek concludes that because multicultural education in the sense of pursuing true ethnic plurality is neither viable nor desirable, it should be abandoned as a social ideal to be transmitted in our schools (Mazurek, 1979:37). Instead, he makes the following recommendation:

> Effective legal protection of children from physical abuse and economic deprivation, guaranteed annual incomes, intelligent resource management, a reworking of the taxation system, responsible fiscal policy, rethinking of our public expenditure priorities, questioning consumerism fanned by built-in obsolescence: these are but some of the issues which our 'education' should equip us to address. (Mazurek, 1979:38)

Mazurek's analysis is certainly pointing at a number of weaknesses of multicultural education that are easily ignored or perhaps even deliberately camouflaged in official policy declarations. The validity of his first argument is underscored by the research evidence presented by Forcese (19750, Clement (1975), and Newman (1975). Obviously, the reality of the world outside the school is much more profound than the school's reality, and multicultural education through "ethnicized' curricula cannot compensate for ethnic stereotyping in everyday parlance, or for television programming that derives its rationale from monetary rather than cultural concerns. There can also be no question that the schools' promise of upward social mobility, based on the ideal of a meritocratic society, cannot compensate for entrenched social inequalities which increasingly are based on ascriptive factors.

Mazurek's second argument on the other hand, seems to be questionable, at least to some extent. Looking at his list of desirable elements of education, the aforementioned issues certainly figure prominently in daily discourse and, to some degree, are reminiscent of the public concerns that eventually led to Proposition 13 in the United States. They are symptoms rather than causes, and the misinterpretation of answers to those questions can easily be used as arguments for a conservative retrenchment, as is presently the case in American education (Bryant, 1981).

A third critical view: Lack of socio-historical perspective

Burton (1980) has advanced the most recent and, possibly, the most thorough critique of multicultural education. He examines three problem areas: first, the federal government's lack of control over education and its inability to prescribe multiculturalism

in schools; second, the federal government's faulty understanding of multiculturalism; and third, the questionable assumption that schools can be expected to solve social problems.

As far as the first argument is concerned, the national government must rely on other agencies for implementation of its policy. More importantly, Burton questions the extent to which cultural improvements can be affected by any government in Canada, because as he claims,

> what occurs culturally, especially to minorities, is often not caused by human intent. Rather, it is likely to be the result of socio-historical factors which may work according to a logic that can be explained, but is only partially and sporadically affected by what people or groups intend? (Burton, 1980:13).

Burton's second argument is perhaps even more probing. Underlying the multicultural policy are the politically liberal notions of integration and cultural improvement. The former is seen as preferable to either assimilation or pluralism. Realistically, both pluralism, in the sense of separating minorities from one another, and assimilation, in the sense of absorbing them into mainstream society, are more likely to happen than genuine integration which, at least in some cases, might be desired by minorities, but impossible to achieve due to cultural circumstances. Cultural improvement, particularly through the schools, is a liberal belief that still needs to be substantiated, despite claims to the contrary by educators, ranging from Dewey to Silberman.

The foregoing criticism leads Burton right into the third area of concern: Can schools change society's values? His answer is a definite 'No'. Schools were not founded for such a purpose in the first place, and their preoccupation with social control makes their existence in itself a social problem.

"Where does all this leave multicultural education?" asks Burton, and he suggests that before answering the question, one has to realize that multiculturalism is intricately linked to the contexts of the economy and social class. Only if this connection is clearly recognized, he argues, can "the fog of confusion that mystifies discussions of multiculturalism" (Burton, 1980:45) be dissipated. For this reason, he maintains, the best we can do at the present is to provide a critique of the status quo and thereby aid Canadians to think more clearly about the issue. In the meantime, some steps can be taken to ease the plight of Canadians who, for one reason or another, are not members of mainstream society. Here, Burton conceives of education in the widest possible sense, ranging from institutionalized instruction to the most informal encounters of individuals. Cultural literacy is required especially for minority groups, as is a better understanding of how to deal with bureaucratic institutions, particularly for the poor and for new immigrants. Better understanding of values and customs of members of minority groups would combat discriminatory practices, he claims, and trade unions would have a major role in introducing immigrants or other minority persons to mainstream Canadian life (Burton 1980:50).

The strength of Burton's analysis is in his insistence that schools represent only a small segment of the overall complex that we call a multicultural society. Concentrating our attention on this segment only is inviting failure. Instead, concomitant efforts in all the other areas of social interaction, from industrial relations to day-care facilities, and from political organizations to community groups are needed to make multiculturalism

work. Multicultural education in the classroom is certainly not the most potent element in bringing about a multicultural society.

A synoptic view: Where do we go from here?

The final portion of this paper will attempt to integrate the various arguments so far presented, and to propose a possible basis for future directions. First of all, the three criticisms which were presented above, agree on one point, namely that the conceptual confusion over what constitutes multicultural education is detrimental to developing programs and methods in schools or in school-related activities. There is some agreement that educators alone cannot define the parameters of the concept, since the essence of multiculturalism is contingent upon a certain vision of society. So long as these parameters are not defined and agreed upon by the major actors on the Canadian scene, namely governments as well as ethno-cultural groups, and political parties as well as trade unions, multiculturalism will rest on insecure foundations. Second, given the present dissent in Canadian political life, and given the cultural influences, from outside the country, particularly in education, one might question the utility of multicultural education as it presently exists. Third, the interdependence of ethnicity with social stratification, political objectives, and economic structures places multicultural education in a precarious position in that it can be utilized as an instrument serving particular interest groups. It is in this sense that a multicultural policy can be used as a pacifying ideology that ultimately solidifies the status quo rather than promotes social change. Minor concessions, such as funding folk festivals and promoting folklore, and providing employment or welfare money for members of minorities, may be deemed sufficient to ensure their acquiescence and cooperation. The three critics discussed in this paper seem to agree that after ten years of multicultural policy we have not found as yet a satisfactory answer to what multiculturalism is, and in particular what multicultural education ought to be, as well as to how the multicultural policy announced in 1971 can be implemented.

Where do we go from here? Perhaps one particular weaknesses in many discussions of minority and majority cultures is an overly static view of 'culture', very much like Tylor's definition, (in 1871), of culture as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". The point has been made by Garfinkle (1973:118) that it is not the precise contents of this definition that is important, but the realization that culture is man's accommodative milieu. To speak of the 'culture' of ethnic minorities (or, for that matter, majorities) as if it existed apart from and independent of Canadian mainstream culture would be misleading. Rather, in following Garfinkle's reasoning, the very existence of the various groups within the boundaries of Canada's material and non-material environment as their 'accommodative milieu' entails the notion that inherited beliefs and customs, have to be tested daily against the realities of life within Canadian society. Francophones in 1981 would thus be culturally different from what they were in 1971, the same way as anglophone Albertans would have changed culturally during those years, precisely because their 'milieu' has changed, requiring them to develop new patterns of accommodation. Not only would they add to their 'culture' through their daily experience, but the newly acquired elements would modify the meaning of previously accumulated elements in a new synthesis that enables a person to develop an adaptive and meaningful response to social reality.

The importance of this argument lies in the fact that, regardless of government policy and of our own likes and dislikes, we live in a multicultural society which is characterized by continuous interpenetration of cultural norms and customs shaping our identities. Although official policies may 'legitimize' certain cultural trends and establish priorities for supporting or inhibiting newly developing accommodative patterns, we have to realize that it is the reality of social, political, and economic life that constitutes our 'milieu'. Taken in this sense, education is essentially multicultural due to the fact that children of various social and ethnic backgrounds live together and influence each other. But, more importantly, it is the 'milieu' of the school, the way in which it reflects the wider society, that assumes the function of 'legitimizing' certain accommodative patterns.

The argument does not end at this point. The gradual disappearance of national boundaries, both through the emergence of supra-national communities and improved trans-continental communication and transportation, projects the 'multicultural' nature of modern societies on a world-wide screen. This new reality may cause considerable problems in terms of adequate accommodative responses to totally new 'milieux'. And yet, we have no other choice than to deal with the new reality, as honestly and as constructively as we can.

Multicultural education in our classrooms, thus, becomes the necessary preparation of our young for a multicultural society of global dimensions. Regardless of what we call it, multicultural education, transcultural education (Garfinkle, 1973), or intercultural education (Hoopes, 1980), we have moved beyond the point where the question "Do we want to have multicultural education?" offers an alternative. We have also moved beyond the point where governments can debate whether or not we ought to opt for a multicultural society.

FOOTNOTES

1. English as a second language.

2. Nigel Grant, Professor of Comparative Education at the University of Glasgow, whose paper is included in this Yearbook, was one of the non-Canadian participants (Ed.)

REFERENCES

Bryant, Gene. "Entanglement by the New Right," *Saskatchewan Bulletin*, Vol. 47, No. 10, January 30, 1981.

Burnet, Jean. "The Policy of Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: A Stock-Taking." Current Opinion/L'Etat Actuel. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2.

Burton, Anthony. "Federal Policy and Multicultural Education," unpublished manuscript, May, 1980.

Cipywnyk, Sonia. "Bilingualism and Multiculturalism in Education," in Keith A. McLeod (ed.). *Multiculturalism, Bilingualism, and Canadian Institutions*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1979.

Clement, Wallace. *The Canadian Corporate Elite*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1975.

Cultures Canada. Newsletter of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, Vol. 1, No. 10, November-December, 1980.

Forcese, Dennis. *The Canadian Class Structure*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1975.

Garfinkle, Harry. "The Transcultural Education of Teachers," in T. Morrison and A. Berton (eds.). *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada Ltd., 1973.

Gibson, Margaret. "Approaches to multicultural education in the U.S.: Some Concepts and Assumptions," *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1976.

Hoopes, David S. *Intercultural Education*. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundations, 1980.

Livingstone, D. W. *Public Attitudes Toward Education in Ontario 1978: The O.I.S.E. Survey Report.* Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978.

Mazurek, Kas. "Rethinking Multiculturalism: Ideals, Education and Social Reality," in K. Mazurek (ed.). *Educational Futures.* Edmonton: The University of Alberta, 1979.

Newman, Peter C. *The Canadian Establishment.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart-Bantam Ltd., 1975.

Palmer, Howard. *Immigration and the Rise of Multiculturalism.* Toronto: Copp Cloark Publ., 1975.

Porter, John. "Ethnic Pluralism in Canadian Perspective," in N. Glazer and D. P. Moynihan (eds.). *Ethnicity: Theory and Practice.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Watson, Keith. "Educational Policies in Multi-Cultural Societies," *Comparative Education*, Vol. 15, No. 1, March, 1979.

Wood, Dean D. *Multicultural Canada.* Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978.

Young, Jonathan C. "Education in a Multicultural Society: What Sort of Education? What Sort of society?" *Canadian Journal of Education*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 1979.

317

Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education: Policy and Practice

Keith A. McLeod
University of Toronto

Le développement de la politique de multiculturalisme pendant les années soixante-dix a été marqué par l'égalité de statut des groupes ethno-culturels au Canada, par un sentiment plus large d'accessibilité et de participation à cause du partage des cultures, et, par conséquent, par un choix plus grand pour les individus de refléter la variété de la société canadienne et d'en jouir. Le multiculturalisme s'est intégré dans l'identité canadienne de même qu'un plus grand intérêt aux droits humains et civils.

Un examen du développement de l'éducation multiculturelle indique que trois approches de base s'emploient: l'approche ethnique, la considération de problèmes spécifiques, et l'orientation interculturelle. Chacune de ces formes est analysée. La communication finit par une discussion de la mise en oeuvre de l'éducation multiculturelle au niveau provincial, par les conseils scolaires, et dans les écoles.

Multiculturalism is as Canadian a concept as there is because ethnic and racial pluralism is a prime characteristic of Canada's population. To recognize the ethno-cultural heritage of Canadians does not diminish the fact that we are Canadians. The attempts to transfer the socio-cultural reality of pluralism and policy into educational practice in the past ten years is a mixture of success and failure. The following analysis shall examine the meaning of the idea of multiculturalism as it has emerged in the past ten years, the approaches to multicultural education, and how the schools have adopted multiculturalism as an ethic.

Canada's population is approximately one-third Anglo-Canadian, and one-third French-Canadian, while the other third traces its heritage to diverse cultures or countries. Pluralism was a characteristic of the population prior to the advent of the European settlement — the Native Peoples were tribally and linguistically diverse. Immigration and settlement increased the social complexities so that there were people in Canada of many racial and ethnic backgrounds. Following the confederation of Canada, in 1867, stress was placed on assimilation as a facet of nation building. Anglo-Canadians came to view themselves as the host society. Many ethnic groups, in order to withstand the pressures, established their own organizations and institutions, including private full time or part-time after-school education. The emphasis on assimilation gradually abated following World War II and greater recognition was given to the realities of cultural pluralism. The heavy post-war immigration, the end of Empire, the Black civil rights movement in the United States, the growth of ethnic diversity in the very centres of Anglo-Canadian power, and the increasing French-Canadian nationalism all promoted recognition of pluralism. In 1969 the Parliament of Canada adopted The Official Languages Act. The need, that was expressed by many Canadians, for a broader policy that would recognize the importance of the non-English and non-French population resulted in the development of the policy of multiculturalism.

When the federal policy was announced on October 8th, 1971, the Prime Minister indicated that "although there are two official languages, there is no official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other. . . . A policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework commends itself to the government as the suitable means of assuring the cultural freedom of Canadians." He also stated that, "Canadian identity will not be undermined by multiculturalism. Indeed, we believe that cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity. Every ethnic group has the right to preserve and develop its own culture and values within the Canadian context." He added that "a policy of multiculturalism must be a policy for all Canadians."[1]

What does multiculturalism mean and how has it emerged in the past ten years? The first fundamental principle of the policy, as stated, is *equality of status*. In many respects this has not been achieved although some progress has been made. There has been a tendency to regard multiculturalism as a policy for immigrants and 'ethnics'; not for all Canadians. Some Anglo-Canadians still persist in viewing themselves as superior, and French-Canadians have been loath to regard themselves as an ethnic group. In the first instance some Anglo-Canadians do not want to recognize that Anglo-dominance is an ideal and policy of the past, that Canada has become increasingly diverse. In the second instance, French-Canadians have aimed at securing equality of status with the Anglo-Canadians. The increased power of French-Canada, exemplified in the strength of the province of Quebec and in the nationalism of the Quebecois, which other Canadians have had to reckon with, has meant they have been preoccupied with bilingualism while neglecting multiculturalism.[2] In some cases they see cultural dualism as a logical consequence or corollary to linguistic dualism. Sometimes the two concepts are used interchangeably.[3]

Equality of status was not intended to mean that all ethnic groups would have equal impact. Historically English and French-Canadians have had a great influence in Canadian society and cultural life. That they will continue to do so is not a major issue. What is increasingly being demanded is symbolic and real recognition of the 'Third Force'. Several years ago the concept of the Third Force was, on analysis, rejected as being an exaggeration bordering on a myth.[4] Perhaps that analysis is dated as there is increasing evidence of co-operation among the non-French and non-English Canadians. These 'other' ethnic groups have now formed a national coalition to ensure that their collective voice is heard in addition to their individual voices. Continued efforts to ignore, squelch, contain, or reject that third group would make a mockery of multiculturalism. They would make a reality of the charge that multiculturalism is "window-dressing".

A second basic principle that is part of the policy of multiculturalism is the emphasis upon *the Canadian identity*. One of the questions most frequently posed regarding multiculturalism is, "Where does it provide for being Canadian?" The answer to this question is in the 1971 announcement and in the practice of the past ten years. Multiculturalism was to be seen within a bilingual framework and Canadian society. Thus to be Italian-Canadian, English-Canadian or Japanese-Canadian was not to deny Canadian identity, but to recognize a component of it, pluralism — "the very essence of Canadian identity." We originated from many backgrounds, but that does not deny a sense of commonality. There is recognition that Canadian citizenship is a priority, that what Canadians mutually develop and adopt has a fundamental place in Canadian identity. First, the assumption which people who ask the question often do not analyse is that what they regard as "simply Canadian" is really part of their particular ethno-cultural

heritage. Second, notwithstanding such faulty assumptions, multiculturalism does not relegate or deny commonality. On the contrary it postulates that all Canadians be recognized as part of mainstream society.

In this connection, another of the fundamental principles underlying multiculturalism is *sharing* our culture — values, attributes, histories, experience, and institutions. One factor that many English-Canadians and French-Canadians do not reflect upon is that many institutions which they have dominated and regarded as part of mainstream Canadian life were, and still are, very exclusive to their groups. If they wish these to be regarded as truly Canadian, participation and control must be extended.[5] Government agencies, boards of directors, clubs, associations, professions, unions, and businesses must open their doors to people not only as customers and clients but also as participants.

Another major aspect and principle of multiculturalism is that people would have greater *choice* of life-styles and cultural traits. Discrimination and stereotypes have limited peoples' conceptions of themselves and of others. By living an ethnocentric life, we limit our own opportunities to experience cultural variety and enjoy it. At the group level people may not be able to fully understand, or participate in other cultures, but they can be secure enough in their own identity to transcend cultural boundaries and appreciate other groups' perspectives, traits, and behaviour without feeling threatened. Even in relatively homogeneous societies there is cultural variety which must be understood; the same understanding must be extended to life in a pluralistic society. At the personal level, choice means that to be Scottish-Canadian, for example, one is not 'required' to eat oatmeal or haggis, play bagpipes, dance reels, read Burns, or even speak Gaelic.

The concern for and protection of *civil rights and human rights* that has developed strongly in Canada since World War II is another fundamental aspect of multiculturalism. The common law has been the traditional protection for rights but a brief examination of Canadian history will find many instances where legislatures and courts have neglected to protect basic human rights with reference to schooling, public service, private business, property, and general civil rights including the right to vote.[6] Segregated schooling, the seizure of the property of Japanese Canadians, denial of service in restaurants and hotels, the disfranchisement of Chinese Canadians, the exclusion of Jews from clubs and associations, and discrimination against Pentacostals and Hutterites in the exercise of their religious beliefs, are but a few examples of prejudice and discrimination.

In the 1940s there was a trend to enact specific legislation to prevent discrimination. Manitoba and Ontario were among the initiators of anti-discriminatory legislation. The Ontario Racial Discrimination Act in 1944 prohibited signs and notices that restricted the use of public facilities on the basis of race or creed. Fair accommodation practices acts, fair employment acts, and later full human rights codes have been enacted to protect people from discrimination on grounds of race, creed, and colour.[7] Several provinces as well as the federal government have established Human Rights Commissions to assist in the discovery, rectification, or prosecution of infringements. Much remains to be accomplished. The provincially legislated codes as well as the federal (Diefenbaker) human rights law can be circumvented or even removed by simple legislative enactment. Human rights commissions have had limited success, for various reasons, including limited budgets. In the final analysis, human rights are dependent upon an educated and informed public. The paucity of literature and research on human rights, the violations by the

media, the inability of human rights commissions to act, the absence of human rights education, and the increasing number of subversive organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan, indicate that more attention needs to be given to human and civil rights.

Multiculturalism, as a concept and in practice, has grown in scope and depth in the past ten years but has not been unchallenged as the resistance and as the examples of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination attest. In the field of education there have been some successes and failures. Before examining specific examples of what has been attempted or neglected in education, I shall analyse the three major types or forms of multicultural education that have most commonly been suggested or implemented in Canada.[8]

Approaches to Multicultural Education

One type of multicultural education has been the *ethnic specific*, the purposes of which have been to counteract assimilative forces, extend the familiar socialization, or generally broaden the child's or adult's knowledge, involvement, or acquaintance with the ethnic heritage. Ethnic schools (full-time or after school, public or private), and ethno-cultural programs, that usually include language courses, are the most common examples. By extending the contact of the person with the ethnic culture, greater immersion is achieved. The ethno-cultural communities, by providing or securing such facilities, extend the institutional completeness of the community, and consequently promote cultural continuity and development.

In a very real sense, this type of ethno-cultural education antedates the adoption of the policy of multiculturalism. Ethnic groups established private schools based on their heritage as a defense mechanism against assimilation.[9] Part-time schools have been the most common instrument for cultural survival. Operating after public school hours and on weekends, these schools teach language and cultural courses in such languages as Chinese, Portuguese, Italian, or German. Less common institutions promoting cultural retention are the full time schools. These have usually attempted to meet provincial curricular regulations and, at the same time, to provide partial immersion in the ethnic culture. Hebrew and Anglo schools have been the most common examples, although other ethnic groups such as the French, Scandinavians, Germans, Ukrainians and Mennonites have also supported private institutions.[10] Particular agreements have been made between Hutterite communities and provincial authorities whereby the schools on their communes are ethnically exclusive but teach the provincial curriculum as well as provide the dogma and language (low German) of the Hutterite Brethern, (a form of Anabaptism).[11] Other examples of where communities have adopted linguistic and cultural programs for their children can be seen among the Native People. Native children were educated at day schools on reserves or in boarding schools which provided programs that were blatant attempts at deculturation and assimilation. For a brief period in the late 1960s and early 70s, integrated schools, invariably off reserves, became policy. Native Peoples criticized these schools because they provided a one-way integration, or as some claimed, covert assimilation. The failure of schooling among the Native Peoples has been spectacular; until recently only about ten percent of their children secured senior matriculation. Most recently, Native control of Native education has become the policy. The native Peoples, with governmental support, increasingly provide for education in the Native languages. In Saskatchewan, for example, forty to sixty percent of the school day may be instructed in their languages.[12]

Ethnic specific forms of multicultural education have achieved some important purposes. They have bolstered the sense of security and continuity of the communities and they have enabled children, by increasing their sense of identity and security, to bridge gaps that have existed between their ethnic communities and the larger society. They have enabled many children to cope with both the ethnic culture of their families and community, and the cultures beyond.[13] Insofar as such programs have assisted children and communities, people recognize their importance and success. However, ethnic specific programs are not the most feasible form of multicultural education in mixed communities, although Canadian society could easily accommodate many more ethnic specific programs than exist at present.

A second major type of multicultural education is *problem oriented:* specific programs are developed to answer particular perceived needs or demands associated with schooling and the assimilation or integration of people of diverse backgrounds. English as a second language or as a second dialect courses and compensatory programs for the 'disadvantaged' are the most common forms.[14]

The growth of English as a second language (ESL) programs, established in response to high rates of immigration during the early post World War II years, failed to meet the demand. Many provincial and local school systems were unprepared to meet the needs of immigrant children and their parents. Immigrant children were abandoned in the back rows of many classrooms, left to fend for themselves, placed in lower grades, or placed in vocational courses.[15] The evidence is quite clear; school systems were simply not sensitive to the needs and demands of immigrant children. The haphazard nature of Canada's immigration policy which provided little or no assistance for settlement and adjustment compounded the problems of the school authorities. In other instances the sheer weight of the number of immigrants overwhelmed the schools.

Nor was the situation any better for the adults. Programs for adults had not been a strong feature of education in Canada. Immigrant adult males tended to learn English on the job while females, often confined to the home, had difficulty learning one of Canada's main languages. Again it took time, too much time, for institutions to respond to obvious needs.[16] The training of teachers for children and adult programs was equally inadequate. Faculties of education, as an examination of their calendars demonstrates, did not develop programs for training ESL teachers until some twenty years after the post War immigration began.

The most critical aspect of the school ESL programs was that they were assimilative, not integrative. They were assimilative in that the stress was on English as a substitute for the mother tongue. It has taken many systems a long time to think of English as an "additive" language rather than "substitutive" language; the same may be said for the cultural aspects of the programs. The result was that children were often alienated from the security of their families and communities. The substitutive ethic of the program was one reason many teachers demonstrated such frustration when students continued to identify with their ethno-cultural heritage.[17]

In the case of adults, additional frustrations were evident. There was only sporadic support and funding for the courses. Moreover, some institutions resisted providing programs which they did not see as part of their function. Often the only assistance came from voluntary and semi-voluntary agencies that were willing to operate programs on inadequate funding. The lack of training of the teachers in human relations also led to frustration in understanding the cultural backgrounds which the adults brought to the

class. Voluntary agencies, like the school systems, tended to regard the immigrants and their cultures as a 'problem'. This perspective made it difficult for the immigrants to relate to the agencies and teachers in a positive manner. They did not perceive their language and culture as a problem.[14]

The increased immigration of people from English-speaking countries whose dialect was quite different from Canadian dialects necessitated the establishment of English as a second dialect course (ESD). At first the children were placed in ESL classes, but dissatisfaction with placing English-speaking children in ESL resulted in ESD. Again sufficient care was not taken to adopt an additive philosophy instead of a substitutive one.

The preschool programs were designed for 'disadvantaged' children. The fundamental idea was to establish institutional care in order to supplement the disadvantaged environment of the child. Again the assumption was made that the cultural environment of the family was incorrect or at least inadequate. When the general society and teachers had this negative attitude, the perspective became a self-fulfilling prophecy; the children came to see their culture and themselves as inadequate. There were few early childhood programs that adopted a different set of assumptions, namely, to provide for the development of the children in their own linguistic and cultural milieu while gradually introducing the dominant language and culture on an additive basis.[19]

On the other hand, a genuine recognition of the economic handicaps of 'disadvantaged' families could provide support and attention. Economic and social inequality are world-wide human phenomena, and are related to educational achievement. Schools are only one agency that can respond to inequality and they are incapable of solving the problem.[20] Those schools, however, that are supportive, consistent, caring, and demanding, tend to secure greater success and mobility for their students; but, in a society demarcated on the basis of social inequality, head start programs for young children are not likely to create equality of educational opportunity; they tend to be palliative.

Unfortunately, even compensatory programs that consciously attempt to bolster the chances of older children for success in society, face much the same chances of success and failure. Inasmuch as they provide assistance to children who have persisted, encouragement to children who are on the verge of leaving school, and to others who have returned to school, the programs are valuable. Often they are band-aids that allow inflexible and insensitive school systems to continue. The best assistance that the compensatory programs provide is crucial cognitive knowledge, and skills for dealing with the larger society. Other compensatory programs which stress ethnic heritage can also assist students by bolstering their sense of pride in their culture and heritage. Their self-concept improves and this increases their 'ability' to learn. In the latter type of program it is often the ethnic group that provides the programs to counter the neglect of the public school.

Another form of problem oriented multicultural education is the antidiscrimination program. It is usually crisis connected. Violence, name calling, stereotyping, and other forms of prejudice manifest in the society are countered through crash programs or units of sensitization that are made part of the school curriculum. Regrettably, such programs are often short term and intermittent. In that they focus upon a problem they can raise peoples' consciousness; however, care must be taken that the 'reasons' for the problem are not laid at the feet of the victims. Another difficulty is that 'crash' programs may be superficial; they fail, because they see human relations only in simplistic ethnic or racial terms rather than in the broader context of the economic, political, and social *power* relationships. Another difficulty that has been discovered with some of the

anti-discriminatory units or programs is that they may emphasize the differences to the exclusion of similarities and, consequently, highlight the improbability of improving human and group relationships.[21] Placed in a broader context and as part of a more pervasive approach, antidiscriminatory content can play an important role in improving education.

The *cultural/intercultural* is the third major type of multicultural education. The focus is upon developing capabilities that will enable people to live in a pluralistic society: individuals who will be capable of transcending the boundaries of their own ethnic cultures. Skills, knowledge, attitudes and emotions are developed so that persons acquire a sense of security of their own being and group identity, a knowledge of other cultures and sub-cultures, and the facility to behave and act capably in more than one culture. The most significant aspect of this kind of multicultural education, in its ideal form, is that multiculturalism becomes an ethic that pervades the educational or school system.[22]

In practice, school systems in several provinces appear to be attempting to implement this form of multicultural education. The bilingual and bicultural programs that are open to children of all backgrounds, the heritage language programs that are part of publicly supported school systems, and the schools that stress cultural understanding in their curricula and activities, are part of this kind of multicultural education. It is easiest and most practical type of multicultural education for the mixed communities that are so characteristic of Canadian society.

In contrast to problem oriented multicultural education, the cultural/intercultural oriented approach is not crisis-based, but grounded in a realistic appraisal of the nature of Canadian society. Nor is it dependent upon the ethnic mix or the extent of heterogeneity or homogeneity that exists in a particular community or school. It recognizes that the mobility of families and of maturing adolescents often results in their moving into a new cultural milieu. It is a broad approach to multicultural education but it is not amorphous because it is based upon the fundamentals of the policy of multiculturalism. Thus the school systems stress the official languages of Canada and at the same time provide for instruction in, or the learning of, other languages. Several Anglophone provinces now provide for teaching in French and the teaching of French as early as kindergarten or primary school. Similarly several provinces allow local school systems to teach in, or teach, heritage languages as part of a child's education. The development of language programs is evidence of a greater sense of equality of status while recognizing official bilingualism. English and French are the *link* languages of Canada and the 'property' of all Canadians; heritage languages give linguistic recognition to the idea that there is no official culture or dominant cultural group.

The cultural/intercultural form of multicultural education also provides recognition of other basic aspects of multiculturalism. Ethno-cultural groups see themselves as sharing public institutions (schools or libraries), and see these institutions as supportive of their familial and ethnic cultures. The school, by building upon the familial-ethnic culture instead of ignoring it, or countering it, improves the possibility of assisting the children to maintain and develop positive self-concepts, which are so crucial to learning and development. Institutions and programs that reflect cultural variety also enable students to develop some sense of the variety of values and attributes that Canadians, individually or collectively hold. From an early age children can learn positive attitudes that will enable them to transcend the boundaries of their ethno-cultural heritages. By relating their school experience to social diversity, students can see that there are alternative

lifestyles that are valued, and that individuals can make choices regarding the values and behaviour that they wish to adopt or practise.

The examination of the cultures and languages of Canada gives students a better knowledge and appreciation of what Canada is, and who Canadians are. In other words, it can give students an understanding of Canadian citizenship, of our commonalities, as well as our differences. The combination of equality of status and shared development, which can be found in school programs, gives a greater meaning to citizenship in a pluralistic society. The cultural/intercultural approach to multicultural education also gives scope for the development of sound concepts of human and civil rights. The study of civil and human rights gives students a cognitive basis upon which they can examine their own society as a means of understanding other societies. Such questions, as, "Are human and civil rights culturally based?" are important. The practice of a sense of human and group equality in the school also provides students with the ethical bases of social and community practice.

The implementation of the cultural/intercultural type of multicultural education has been somewhat hesitant. One major reason for this is that it requires a broader examination or reexamination of the assumptions of education. Bureaucratized schooling involves several levels of policy makers and administration that move slowly. Some educationists resist revision of policies, program and curricula, and the adoption of new resources and materials. The complexity of educational change has frustrated many attempts at change.[23] Instead of examining these impediments, some of the ideas and practices which indicate areas of positive progress need to be looked at.

Multicultural Education in Practice

Several provincial ministries of education have supported, to varying degrees, cultural/intercultural education. Few provinces, however, have adopted a comprehensive policy on multicultural education that outlines basic principles and areas of concern. The lack of provincial policies is a serious deficiency because the responsibility for overall policy in Canadian education is vested in the provincial governments and the legislatures. Among the most advanced in establishing an overall approach are the provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and, in a special sense, Quebec.[24] The last mentioned has been particularly noted for its support of Anglophone education in a province that is predominantly (approximately 80%) French-Canadian; however, there has been less of a commitment to other forms of multicultural education.

The province of Ontario has outlined its concern for multicultural education in a document of 'Special Populations in Education'.[25] While this title sounds restrictive, the actual policy is not.

> It has been recognized that the responsibility for preparing all Ontario students to live in Canada's multicultural society has significant implications in terms of general approaches to education, as well as in provision for special populations. In meeting the common needs of all students, publicly provided education has the task of encouraging general system sensitivity, while ensuring that individual and group needs are met in a way that will facilitate full participation by all students in the educational opportunities of the system.[26]

With reference to implementation, the Ontario Ministry of Education has been active in the area where it exercises the greatest control-curriculum. The Ministry has sponsored the development of guidelines for publishers and authors to promote bias-free texts and curriculum materials, disseminated documents to schools outlining a

cultural/intercultural basis for education in the early elementary years, adopted a special certificate for teachers who secure additional training or qualifications in multicultural education, and instigated and adopted a history course for secondary education entitled "Canada's Multicultural Heritage."[27]

The aspect of the Ontario policy and programming that engendered the greatest controversy was the implementation of the Heritage Language Program which provides for the teaching of languages other than English and French on an extended school day or after school hours basis.[28] As of 1978-79 there were some fifty languages being taught to about 75,000 students. In response to the Francophone community in Ontario the Ministry has assisted in the establishment of opportunities for a complete French language education where numbers warrant. In addition the Ministry of Education has promoted instruction in French as a school subject for all elementary students from grade four on; the Ministry has recently encouraged school boards to extend this program from twenty to forty minutes per day. Perhaps the greatest success has been the immersion programs for students who wish to develop a greater proficiency in French. By 1982 some 62% of students in Ontario elementary schools will be enrolled in the regular programs, while 11% will be in the French immersion.[29] Finally, in the area of language, there are the ESL programs for immigrant and Canadian-born children who do not speak English, or whose dialect is sufficiently different from the Canadian to warrant special attention. The ESL language programs are provided for adults as well as for school children.

The Ontario policy and programs also include schemes for continuous evaluation of existing curriculum resources and textbooks, in-service professional development, resource materials for classroom use, consideration for racial and religious minorities, and general citizenship education. Within the Ministry of Education, there is a section specifically responsible for Francophone education with specific officers whose main responsibility is multicultural education.

Although the education of Native People is a federal responsibility, the federal agreements with the provinces have placed many Native children in provincial schools. The province of Ontario has provided for special membership of Native People on local boards of education, developed curriculum resources regarding Native People for schools, and appointed a ministry official who has special responsibility for overseeing the province's responsibilities in Native education. While many of the essential policies, programs, and structures are in place, much remains to be done in implementation at the local level. Secondary schools have been slower than elementary schools in adopting multicultural education, because they are more discipline and subject oriented, and their teachers have been less innovative.

A somewhat different policy, in relation to language, exists in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. These three provinces with legislature provisions and government policies that provide for languages other than English and French as languages of instruction, have maintained a more linguistic view of multicultural education. However, there appears to be an interest in Manitoba in broadening the definition of multicultural education. The Manitoba Teachers' Society at the annual general meeting in March, 1980, debated adopting a multicultural education policy. While the decision was deferred, indications are that a cultural/intercultural type of multicultural education will receive their support. The original resolution included the concept that "each cultural group in Canada had a right to maintain and promote its continued existence and to have the obligation to respect other cultures", and that this recommendation

be fostered through the education system by means of teacher awareness, curricula, heritage languages, resources, texts, exchanges, and the cultural programs.[30] The annual meeting was also asked to recommend action by the Department of Education and its Minister. There are indications that the Ministry is now considering a more general approach to multicultural education.

The Manitoba Teachers's Society has published a background paper entitled *Multiculturalism and Education in Manitoba* which indicates that the implementation of multicultural education

> is not simply a matter of introducing a new course nor is it just the teaching of another ancestral language. Although it may include these aspects, it should be viewed as an all-encompassing approach with three major components: mainstream multicultural education, immigrant orientation and New Canadian awareness, [and] ancestral languages of established ethnocultural groups.[31]

A similar thrust appears imminent in Nova Scotia. In 1979, the Nova Scotia Teachers' Union (NSTU) provincial executive established a committe on multiculturalism whose function was to examine multiculturalism in that province and to recommend a policy. The policy was duly established. Again a broad cultural/intercultural thrust was adopted, based upon ethno-cultural awareness, equality of opportunity and equality of access, teacher sensitivity, curriculum reform, and the development of support services, programs, materials and resources. In order to disseminate these ideas, the NSTU is now mounting a Multiculturalism In-Service Workshop to be carried out over the year in cooperation with the Ethnic Services Division of the Department of Education. Fifty teachers from different areas of the province will be trained to handle sensitivity workshops, to use techniques for implementing multiculturalism, and to disseminate information about multicultural education resources.[32] This project of the Nova Scotia Teachers' Union, like the action of the Manitoba Teachers' Society, is an important step in the general promotion of multicultural education in the provinces.

Let us now turn our attention to the individual school boards that operate the local schools in most provinces. To illustrate positive action, the efforts of two particular boards will be highlighted — the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, and the Toronto Board of Education. School boards are important in that they provide additional direction, establish policy priorities at the local level, and determine funding allocations. In 1978 the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 adopted a policy to encourage multicultural enrichment programs, to promote immigrant education, and to maintain liaison with the various ethnic communities.[33] In March, 1980, the Board outlined further action. A Committee on Multicultural Education (C.O.M.E.) was organized to establish goals and objectives. A draft report of the Committee set out that the schools should "create units, programs, [and] courses on many facets of multiculturalism to be used interdisciplinarily and crossgrades in Winnipeg schools for children and adults (e.g., maintenance of cultural heritage, interaction of cultural heritage, maintenance of mother tongue, bilingual programs etc.)"[34]

The Winnipeg School Division has begun to implement the policy while it is still in the final stages of definition. For example, teachers' aides of various ethnic backgrounds have been employed in the schools to supplement and support the regular teachers. The Winnipeg School Division has also published brochures in various languages to inform the parents of the school system, and it has given encouragement to language instruction and to the inclusion of multicultural content.

Beginning in 1972, the Toronto Board of Education sponsored a series of studies and issued a series of reports that culminated with a final report on multicultural education in March, 1976. The process included a series of community hearings where parents could make their views known. Teachers within the system participated in the discussions and reacted to the briefs and reports. Until the review process took place there had been isolated programs but "some trustees felt that these programs would remain isolated — and perhaps serve only as tokenism — unless they existed as part of a broad Board policy on multiculturalism."[35] In essence the Toronto Board found that it was operating a system based upon a single cultural orientation (Anglo-Canadian), while in reality the community was ethno-culturally pluralistic. The system was out of touch with the cultural basis of the community.

The review process itself increased awareness and sensitivity. "One of these teachers who held to her view made an about-turn. After working with some youngsters she said, 'Now I realize what you are talking about. The kids respond so much more readily when their background is taken into account.' Here is a teacher trained in England with 20 years of experience and who probably has about 10 years left. She was dead against the briefs, but she had seen how a few words in Polish helped to light up the eyes of a child".[36]

In the process of reorienting the Toronto school system to multiculturalism, the committee found varying understandings among the educators and community as to what multicultural education should be. Some saw it as the maintenance of language and culture, others as a means of dynamically developing a Canadian culture through a combination of different ethnic cultures, while another group saw it as a means of assimilation.[37] The interpretations mark the significance of having clearly stated board policies, and the importance of involving the teachers in the process so that they reorient their thinking rather than just place a new label on what they continue to do or have always done.

The Toronto Board proceeded to implement a list of recommendations and changes that identified three main areas of concern: language education, system sensitivity, and school-community relations. Greater concern and stress were placed upon ESL and ESD programs. A New-Canadian student was now defined by the Toronto Board as "any student who may be unable to achieve academic success with regular programs because his or her language dialect or culture is different from that of the school system."[38] Reception classes, transition classes, and withdrawal classes received greater support and attention. The final report advocated "a staff sensitive to the needs, hopes, and aspirations of its community, and familiar with the deep and abiding meanings of its traditions, heritage, and race."[39] There was to be in-service education to achieve these ends.

Perhaps the most dynamic changes came in the area of school-community relations. Early in the process, in the summer of 1975, the Board established a School-Community Relations Department. It was to act not only as a liaison between the school and community but also between the curricula and programs and the needs of the community. One prime change that was extremely important was the willingness of the Board to provide students and community service (social workers, psychologists) personnel with the ability to speak community languages. The Board was intent on providing the services and support which the very heterogeneous population required — more than fifty per cent of the students entered the school with a mother tongue other than English.

School boards in Canada, in the past ten years, have given greater attention to

multicultural concerns. However, most boards have not developed comprehensive policies but have shown greater interest in educational costs. The combined effect has been that multicultural programs have been viewed as added extra costs. It can be argued that immigrant parents, minorities, and multicultural education for mainstream students have not received their just share of the educational tax dollars. Education for diversity, human rights education, programs for immigrant students, language instruction, and general support services should receive greater board priority to assist the schools under their jurisdictions.

The greatest successes in multicultural education have occurred where the school staffs have collectively examined their educational goals, objectives, and programs in the light of the diversity in Canadian society, including their particular community. Some school staffs considered administrative, program, teacher, student and community needs as a part of a comprehensive picture. Some examples of implementing multicultural education in each of these areas will be examined.[40]

First, administrators have the leadership responsibility to be continually working with the community and staff to answer particular needs. Specifically, principals can provide the time and means for explaining the school to parents. In communities with New Canadian parents, principals have adopted practices such as: sending information to parents in appropriate languages, utilizing interpreters and community liaison workers, adjusting school events to community concerns and values, and providing outreach programs to encourage reticent parents to participate.

Second, in the area of programming some schools have become sensitive to language needs, to curriculum adjustment, and to considering extra-curricular activities. Such schools try to bridge cultural gaps, and, in general, base their programs on both long and short term needs. Interesting and successful programs have been built around 'human and group identity.' Such programs acknowledge that it is insufficient to regard each child simply as an individual because children bring their group identities to the schools. These identities or cultures must be recognized if the schools are to provide the best learning environment.

Third, the teacher factor in schooling is crucial to the success or failure of multicultural education. Teachers are not generally curriculum developers; they teach curricula that are usually ready made. Consequently a multicultural curriculum is most successful if the teachers' attitudes and assumptions are somewhat congruent with those of the program. It is important for individual teachers to realize that they need not be hamstrung in implementing their awareness and sensitivity by a dated or biased curriculum. The teachers' attitudes and behavior towards students, their verbal and non-verbal communication, their skills and strategies, the emphasis and examples within the curriculum, their preparation and approach to topics or content, and their use of texts and resources all have potential to develop or to stultify the students' sense of worth and identity, their belief in their future, and their view of their chances of success or failure.

Fourth, students have played important roles in the implementation of multicultural education. Students have suggested establishing cultural clubs which give support to their identities and needs. Clubs developed around Black, Italian, Indian, or Chinese cultural concerns have a legitimate role in schooling. They have sometimes been the stimulus that has led to curriculum or extracurricular adjustment. Similarly students of various backgrounds can be a positive teaching resource if they approached and worked with in a

sensitive manner. They become involved and concerned in school activities that promote human relations, personal identity, and group development.

Finally, the community has played a major role in some schools, and its involvement can reinforce and support multicultural education. Are parents utilized as resource persons or volunteers? Are the cultural values and institutions in the community recognized? Is the school demonstrating an interest in all segments of the community? Are 'we' reaching out to parents and the community? Are there special needs in some groups? These are a few of the questions that school personnel ask when they implement multicultural education. Community involvement has been a major complement to the professionalism of teachers in developing multicultural education.

In conclusion, multiculturalism as a policy is only ten years old. The policy has broadened and developed during that time. While it has been developed in cultural, social, and political spheres, it has also developed in the field of education. Whereas initial efforts in the educational area were problem oriented or ethnic specific, there has been a visible shift toward emphasizing a more comprehensive cultural-intercultural approach. One hundred years of public schooling that stressed uniformity and conformity has not been nor could be altered in ten years. The shortcomings of education in relation to social class, ethnic diversity, race relations, the handicapped, the gifted and the slow learners are the shortcomings of society. Schools which do not provide for individual and group particularities limit social growth, human development, and group dynamics. Multicultural education is an important aspect of Canadian efforts to come to terms with our diverse self. Multicultural education should be judged by its successes not by its failures, though these must be recognized. Measured by the increased attention to human relations, group development, language teaching, teacher awareness and sensitivity, administration adjustments, student interests and concerns, and community involvement there have been successes. If multiculturalism is a Canadian concept, why should there not be more attempts to implement multicultural education? Schools need not be part of the problem.

NOTES:

1. House of Commons, *Debates*, October 8, 1971. For a brief history of multiculturalism see Harold Trooper "An Uncertain Past: Reflections on the History of Multiculturalism" and Keith A. McLeod, "Schooling for Diversity: Ethnic Relations, Cultural Pluralism, and Education", in *Tesl Talk*, Vol. 10, No. 3, Summer 1979.
2. J. Rudnyckyj, "Multiculturalism — A Way Foreward", *Language and Society*, No. 3 Autumn, 1980; and G. Rocher, "Multiculturalism", as State Policy. Report of the Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Ottawa, Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, 1976. For the New Brunswick case see Donald J. Loree, "Multiculturalism in a Bicultural Province," *Multiculturalism*, Vol. 2, 1978.
3. See Government of Quebec, *Quebec-Canada: A New Deal*, (The Quebec government proposal for a new partnership between equals: sovereignty-association, 1979).
4. Jean Burnet, "Myths and Multiculturalism," *Canadian Journal of Education*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1979 and reply in Vol. 5, No. 4, 1980. The original argument about the Third Force is some years old: see Elizabeth Wangenham "The Ukrainians: A Case Study of the "Third Force"", in Peter Russell, *Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
5. Wallace Clement, *The Corporate Elite* illustrates how few 'other' Canadians or even French-Canadians are corporate directors.
6. N. Bruce McLeod, "Human Rights and The Law", in Keith A. McLeod, ed., *Multiculturalism, Bilingualism and Canadian Institutions*. Toronto: Gudance Centre, 1979.

30

7. Ibid.
8. Margaret Gibson, in "Approaches to Multicultural Education in the United States: Some Concepts and Assumptions", *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1976, outlines six approaches to multicultural education but these don't really fit the Canadian situation despite the attempts to apply her categories. For examples of the attempts and difficulties see Vandra L. Masemann, "Multicultural Programs in Toronto Schools", *Interchange*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1978-79, and Jonathan Young, "Education in a Multicultural Society: What Sort of Education? What Sort of Society?", *Canadian Journal of Education*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 1979.
9. Ethnic groups and organizations have been the mainstay of this type of multicultural education. This also applies to the Anglo-Canadians who not only wanted their own children to be inculcated with Anglo-Canadian values but utilized the school system to assimilate others.
10. There are many of these Anglo-Canadian private institutions particularly in Ontario — eg. Upper Canada College, Trinity Port Hope, Havergal, Lakefield, etc. They have been utilized in boundary maintenances not only in relation to ethnicity but particularly with reference to class.
11. John W. Friesen, *People Culture and Learning*. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises, 1977.
12. See the articles by Manoly Lupul and Barbara Burnaby in Canadian Society for the Study of Education, *Yearbook*, Vol. 3, 1976.
13. John R. Young, "Multiculturalism and Its Implication for Youth", in Keith A. McLeod, ed., *Multiculturalism, Bilingualism and Canadian Institutions*.
14. This type of multicultural education either assumes there are problems in carrying out education for assimilation or when instigated by ethnic groups it has been seen as a means of countering the bias inherent in a school system which is based upon assimilation.
15. See such studies as E.N. Wright, *Students Backgrounds and Its Relationship to Class and Program in School*, Toronto Board of Education, 1970; and Mary Ashworth, *Immigrant Children and Canadian Schools*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1975.
16. See "Immigrant Women", Vol. II, No. 4, 1979 issue of *Multiculturalism*, published by the Guidance Centre, Toronto.
17. Loren Lind, "New Canadianism: Melting The Ethnics in Toronto Schools", in G. Martel, *The Politics of the Canadian Public School*. Toronto: James Lewis & Samuel, 1974.
18. When I became involved with an organization in metropolitan Toronto dealing with immigrants and migrants the organizations who were part of this coalition could not understand why ethnic organizations would not participate. Invariably the members of the coalition looked upon immigrants and migrants as problems.
19. See the article by T. Grande in Aaron Wolfgang, ed., *The Education of Immigrant Students*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1975.
20. The work of Michael Katz and others indicates how schools have not come to terms with inequality.
21. Jack Kehoe, "Multiculturalism: The Difficulty of Unpredictable Strategies", *Test Talk*, Vol. 10, No. 3, Summer 1979. There are many difficulties with these studies that use pre-testing and post-testing to assess attitude change. One major factor is that attitudes are developed over a long term and one or two weeks of 'ethnic content' will not change them but it may raise their consciousness of the 'problem' hence more negative attitudes are found on the post test. These kinds of programs and their tests demonstrate the shortcomings of the problem oriented approach which Kehoe has been so involved with at the University of British Columbia.
22. T.R. Morrison, "Transcending Culture: Cultural Selection and Multicultural Education", in Keith A. McLeod, ed., *Intercultural Education and Community Development*. Toronto: Guidance Centre, 1980, and Keith A. McLeod, "Schooling for Diversity: Ethnic Relations, Cultural Pluralim, and Education", in *Test Talk*, Vol. 10, No. 3, Summer, 1979.
23. Douglas Myers, *The Failure of Educational Reform in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1973.
24. Regarding the thinking in Quebec see Camille Laurin "Nationalism, Diversity and Quebec", in *Multiculturalism*, Vol. 1, No. 5, 1978. Saskatchewan is a bit of an anomaly. It is the only province in Canada that has enacted multiculturalism in statute but it has maintained, so far, a rather narrow linguistic approach. However, a broader approach has been implemented by the Saskatoon School Board.

25. Ontario Ministry of Education, *Review and Evaluation Bulletins*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1979, "Special Populations in Education".
26. Ibid. p. 23.
27. Another recent development is Ontario Ministry of Education "A Resource Guide For Teachers, *Black Studies Across The Intermediate Curriculum*. Draft Manuscripts #3.
28. Marshall Amphlett, "The Ontario Heritage Language Program", *Multiculturalism*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1978.
29. Max Yalden, "Language Policy in Ontario's Secondary Schools". Notes for a speech by Max Yalden, Commissioner of Official Languages, to the Ontario Secondary Education Review Project Toronto, September 16, 1980.
30. Typescript copy of the resolution.
31. Manitoba Teachers' Society, *Multiculturalism and Education in Manitoba*, March, 1980. p. 10.
32. Peter McCreath, "Focus on Multiculturalism," in *The Teacher*, Nov. 7, 1980, and "NSTU Statement of Policy and Beliefs" re multiculturalism.
33. Copy of Board resolution.
34. Winnipeg S.D. #1, Proposal of Goals and Objectives Re: Committee on Multicultural Education, Draft #2, May 1980.
35. See Toronto Board of Education, *The Bias of Culture: An Issue Paper on Multiculturalism;* and Work Group on Multicultural Program, *Draft Report*, 1975 and *Final Report*, 1976.
36. "We are all Immigrants To This Place", Toronto, October 1976. A case study prepared mainly by the staff of the Toronto Board of Education for IMTEC. p. 130.
37. Ibid. p. 90 ff.
38. Ibid. p. 78.
39. Ibid. p. 84.
40. The following analysis is based upon reports and studies of a variety of school boards and schools such as those in metropolitan Toronto, Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Vancouver, etc.

Education interculturelle et multiculturalisme: ambiguïtés et occultations*

Michel Laferrière
Université McGill — McGill University

This paper examines in a critical way a new type of trend within education: intercultural, transcultural or multicultural education. A first part studies this new trend through an historical and a comparative way, by attempting to explain why this trend has recently become fashionable in several societies, although similar theories and practices were sometimes attempted years ago. A second part presents some attempts to establish multicultural education by changing the images and stereotypes concerning some cultural groups, by adapting the structures and practices of the schools to the need of specific cultural groups, and by enhancing the cultures of these groups. Devious consequences or, in sociological terms "perverse effects" are presented, such as the creation of cultural and social ghettoes which intercultural education attempts to eliminate, but which may be reinforced by well-meaning educational practices of its proponents. It is concluded that a really transcultural education, transcending cultural but also social class barriers, should now be tried.

Education interculturelle, transculturelle, ou multiculturelle: ces termes sont actuellement à la mode, et ce dans de nombreux pays. Ainsi, par exemple, les minorités ethniques ou raciales aux Etats-Unis et au Canada, les immigrants et les tenants des langues et des cultures locales dans de nombreux pays européens se sont vus, à divers degrés et de différentes façons, reconnaître un certain droit à l'existence dans le système éducatif. Ces termes sont souvent ambigus, et recouvrent des pratiques et des idéologies différentes. Nous voudrions ici tenter non d'examiner toutes ces idéologies et ces pratiques, trop nombreuses, mais d'y trouver des thèmes communs et certaines contradictions et ambiguïtés, liées le plus souvent au caractère polysémique du terme "culture" et à ses usages politiques. Dans un premier temps, nous approcherons l'idée d'éducation interculturelle[1] par détour historique et comparatif, en essayant d'expliquer pourquoi une telle idée, pas complètement nouvelles, a connu un certain essor à partir des années soixante et quelles formes elle a pu prendre. Dans une seconde partie, nous présenterons une certaine critique de cette idée, tenant aux définitions du terme "culture" et à certaines fonctions du système éducatif.

Que l'on ne se méprenne pas sur nos intentions, cependant: cette critique n'a pas pour but l'abandon de l'éducation interculturelle, que nous considérons personnellement comme une intention louable, mais l'abandon de certaines de ses ambiguïtés et la mise à jour de certaines contradictions, qui risquent selon nous de détourner cette intention.

I. *Essor, ou renouveau, de l'éducation interculturelle au cours des années soixante:*

La notion "d'éducation, ou du moins de sensibilisation, interculturelle" n'est sans doute pas nouvelle. En fait, toute culture (au sens de civilisation) est, dans une certaine mesure, ethnocentrique: elle se doit de s'affirmer comme différente des autres, et comme meilleure, ou au moins aussi bien que les autres, afin de survivre lors de contacts avec

d'autres cultures. Or il semble que très peu d'aires culturelles aient jamais été totalement isolées d'autres aires culturelles, et que diffusions et emprunts aient toujours été caractéristiques de l'histoire humaine. Contacts entre cultures ont donc toujours, dans une certaine mesure, voulu dire connaissance interculturelle, même si cette connaissance a le plus souvent été fonction des préoccupations de chaque culture: ainsi, par exemple, les "découvertes" européennes de "terres nouvelles", au début des temps modernes ou au dix-neuvième siècle, ou celle du "bon sauvage" au dix-huitième, n'ont-elles été que des réponses à certaines questions européennes, et la construction d'une certaine donnée: nous ne connaissons malheureusement que rarement les changements idéologiques que le contact avec les Européens a pu provoquer, peut-être parce que ces sociétés étaient le plus souvent de tradition orale usuellement, et certainement parce que ce contact a entrainé, dans la majorité des cas, la destruction de ces sociétés.[2]

Ce qui nous paraît assez remarquable au vingtième siécle, et en particulier depuis quelques dizaines d'années, ou moins longtemps selon les pays, c'est la reconnaissance de l'existence et de la valeur de cultures "autres". Cette reconnaissance ne s'est traduite en politique de l'éducation que depuis les années soixante. On pourrait citer des exceptions: nous avons, par hasard, retrouvé un livre français des années trente (Vernet, 1933), écrit par une institutrice, et intitulé *L'Arc-en-ciel: contes pour la réconciliation*. Cet ouvrage dénonce, à travers des histoires destinées aux enfants, la guerre et l'incompréhension entre les peuples, et plus particulièrement entre Français et Allemands; on pourrait aussi signaler diverses actions anti-racistes, anti-colonialistes, et pacifistes menées par les syndicats et les associations d'enseignants de plusieurs pays européens entre les deux guerres mondiales. On pourrait aussi citer aux Etats Unis toute l'oeuvre de Boas et de ses étudiants ou collègues, parmi lesquels on retrouve Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, ou Otto Klineberg: comme l'a souligné Harris (1968), toute cette école vise à montrer que toute culture ne peut être évaluée qu'à travers ses propres critères, et que la compréhension des sociétés "autres" ne peut se faire qu'en tentant d'allier la rigueur méthodologique de l'observation ethnographique et un certain relativisme culturel. Ces chercheurs ont lutté contre la ségrégation raciale dans leur pays; ils on également influencé les recherches et les déclarations de l'UNESCO contre le racisme, mais leurs vues ont mis relativement longtemps à être traduites en politiques éducative au sein des systèmes scolaires.

Depuis les années soixante, on assiste à une reconnaissance de la diversité des clientèles scolaires, tant au niveau social et ethnique qu'à celui des aptitudes. Cette reconnaissance a pris des formes multiples: établissement de programmes adaptés à cette diversité, que ce soit en terme d'éducation compensatoire, ou afin de préserver certains éléments caractéristiques et différents de ces clientèles, comme dans le cas de l'éducation "ethnique", recrutement de personnel enseignant mieux formé, ou même issu de ces divers groupes eux-mêmes. Différents facteurs ont joué un certain rôle dans cette reconnaissance. D'une part, la notion d'égalité des chances est devenue la notion fondamentale des systèmes scolaires des pays développés et de nombreux pays en voie de développement, qu'il s'agisse d'une égalité devant les ressources offertes, ou d'une égalité de résultats face à l'école (Levine et Bane, eds., 1975), on a donc tenté d'établir une certaine égalité soit en offrant l'acces à des programmes similaires aux enfants de différents groupes, séparés jusque là, parfois en droit, et souvent en fait. On a aussi tenté de répondre aux besoins de ces enfants afin de favoriser leur réussite scolaire et, pensait-on, sociale.[3]

Un second facteur nous semble avoir été tout aussi important: la reconnaissance, du moins en ce qui concerne les groupes ethniques, de leur présence et de leur persistance. Aux Etats Unis, la notion de "melting pot", poussée de l'avant par les immigrants eux-mêmes, au début du vingtième siécle;[4] et qui voudrait que tous se fondent en un nouveau type d'homme, l'Américain, a été critiquée car elle exprimait une idéologie, et non une réalité sociale, et on souligne maintenant les spécificités culturelles de divers groupes américains. Au Canada, l'idéologie nativiste et assimilationniste du début du vingtième siècle, assez comparable par son caractère exclusif au nativisme des Etats Unis, a été remplacée par l'idéologie de la mosaïque, selon laquelle diverses cultures composeraient, non pas en se fondant en un creuset, mais en se juxtaposant dans une mosaïque, un caractère national canadien. Cette mosaïque a été critiquée comme verticale, et inégale (Porter, 1965) et comme privilégiant, de fait, l'élément anglo-saxon. Le début des années soixante-dix a vu l'élaboration d'une idéologie nouvelle, partiellement mythe, mais aussi certainement pratique sociale, comme l'a souligné Burnet (1979): la personnalité canadienne y est définie comme étant formée de plusieurs cultures, qui conservent leurs éléments propres. La politique fédérale de "multiculturalisme" a d'ailleurs été officiellement adoptée par diverses provinces (Burnet, 1979); une politique assez similaire est aussi menée, sous d'autres noms, par les autres.[5] On pourrait également nommer des programmes assez semblables dans les pays d'Europe occidentale, et qui visent à conserver les cultures d'orgine des enfants de travailleurs migrants ou des immigrants eux-mêmes: cours d'arabe, et d'autres langues pour les enfants immigrés en France, subventions à diverses activités culturelles et artistiques, tel le théâtre, par exemple. Ces activités sont en général assez superficielles et modestes quant à leur envergure, mais il faut les signaler car elles dénotent, nous semble-t-il, un changement idéologique important: la reconnaissance de cultures autres.

Dans toutes ces sociétés, la reconnaissance de l'existence de groupes culturellement différents est certainement liée à l'arrivée de ces groupes. Au Canada, les pays d'origine des immigrants ont changé après la seconde guerre mondiale, et encore plus à partir du milieu des années soixante, lorsque certaines discriminations d'immigration liées au pays d'origine ou à la race furent éliminées. En Europe occidentale, l'arrivée d'immigrants provenant des pays moins développés du Sud de l'Europe et des anciennes colonies a modifié la composition ethnique et raciale de la plupart des pays développés, entraînant souvent frictions et racisme. Ces changements quant aux pays d'origine des immigrants expliquent sans doute leur plus grande visibilité au sein des sociétés d'accueil, car dans bien des cas, le pourcentage des étrangers, ou des enfants d'immigrants, n'est pas aujourd'hui supérieur à celui d'époques passées: il y avait, proportionnellement, autant d'étrangers en France dans les années trente qu'aujourd'hui, (Tapinos, 1975, par exemple), et les grandes vagues d'immigration au Canada (Hawkins, 1972, par exemple) ou aux Etats Unis sont fort anciennes. On assiste donc à un changement d'attitudes et de politiques vis à vis des "autres", comme le montre très bien le recueil de textes de Palmer (1974) pour le Canada.

Ce changement, qui nous paraît principalement idéologique, vient sans doute en Amérique du Nord, du poids politique que représentent diverses minorités ethniques: les noirs ont maintenant, en droit comme en fait, le droit de vote aux Etats Unis; les enfants d'immigrants constituent, dans certaines régions du Canada, la majorité de la population. Les hommes politiques doivent donc compter avec ces nouveaux groupes, mais ce type d'explication n'est pas suffisant. Il nous semble que l'intérêt pour ces groupes

minoritaires vient aussi de l'affirmation par les groupes eux-mêmes de leur personnalité propre, au plan national, renforcée au plan international par les diverses décolonisations et l'affirmation de peuples jusque-là opprimés. A cette affirmation s'est ajoutée une réaction aprés la seconde guerre mondiale à l'holocauste et aux extrêmes de l'ethnocentrisme européen que furent le fascisme et le nazisme.

Que l'on insiste sur les raisons idéologiques ou sur l'aspect politique de leurs origines, il semble indéniable que l'éducation des immigrants et des groupes minoritaires, groupes "culturellement autres", est devenue un "problème" on considère que ces groupes ne peuvent plus être traités "comme s'ils étaient comme les autres". On assiste ainsi à un processus de définition d'un problème social, qui existait peut-être, et même sans doute auparavant, mais que certains groupes et individus ont mis en lumière et ont défini, selon un type de processus décrit, par exemple, par Spector et Kitsuse (1977). Nous voudrions maintenant non pas analyser ce processus de définition, ce qui demanderait une étude empirique poussée de différents types de politiques éducatives, mais présenter diverses lignes de ces politiques, illustrations de multiples acceptations du terme "éducation interculturelle" et tenter d'en faire une critique constructive.

II. *Diversités et ambiguïtés des politiques éducatives interculturelles et multiculturelles.*

Les notions "interculturel" et "multiculturel" comportent certaines ambiguïtés liées à la polysémie du terme "culture", que ce soit dans son acceptation scientifique ou dans son acceptation quotidienne. Une acception courante du terme "culture" recouvre tout ce qui concerne des pratiques intellectuelles et sociales valorisées dans certains milieux sociaux, et peut-être même dans la société globale: la culture, "ce qui reste quand on a tout oublié" selon une boutade classique, implique la connaissance d'une certaine littérature, d'un certain théâtre, d'une certaine musique, et de certains arts reconnus comme "nobles". Cette acception du terme "culture" comme "haute"[6] culture, est rarement acceptée comme devant définir l'éducation interculturelle, mais nous verrons par ailleurs que, bien qu'occultée, elle joue un certain rôle dans la définition de ce que sont les cultures "autres". La seconde acception des termes "culture" et "culturel" provient de l'usage du concept anthropologique, et reflète ses ambiguïtés. La culture est alors la civilisation d'un groupe, et recouvre diverses pratiques sociales, qu'elles concernent la culture matérielle et la relation à l'environment, ou l'organisation sociale et idéologique d'un groupe social. Cette acception a en un sens fondé théoriquement l'anthropologie sociale et culturelle[7] mais pose de nombreux problèmes: qu'inclut-on dans la culture? la culture matérielle détermine-t-elle l'organisation sociale et les visions du monde, ou vice-versa? etc. . . . L'acception anthropologique du terme a été traduite de façons différentes dans les pratiques de disciplines appliquées, telles l'éducation ou le travail social. La présence de certains groupes comme les immigrants, les autochtones ou les minorités ethniques de diverses origines, a été interprétée comme devant donner lieu à des pratiques correspondant aux valeurs et aux comportements de ces groupes, (ou du moins de ce que certains considèrent comme étant les valeurs et les comportements de ces groupes). Nous voudrions ici examiner brièvement trois types d'approches: la première consiste à relever, au sein de la culture majoritaire, ou de la culture dominante, les perceptions souvent insultantes et rarement exactes des cultures des groupes "autres" et de tenter de modifier ces perceptions; la seconde tente d'adapter les structures et les pratiques scolaires aux caractéristiques des enfants culturellement différents et de faciliter ainsi leur adaptation;

la troisième enfin consiste à élaborer certaines politiques visant à conserver la culture de ces enfants.

i. Traitement des cultures "autres" et modifications dans les manuels scolaires.

La façon dont les cultures autres que celle du groupe majoritaire ont été traitées par les différents exemples fournis par le système d'éducation a souvent été critiquée. On pourrait citer un grand nombre de recherches, portant par exemple sur le traitement de certains groupes dans les manuels scolaires. Ces recherches ont souvent été, au départ, le fait de membres de groupes minoritaires eux-mêmes: les universitaires noirs et les juifs de la Ligue anti-diffamatoire de B'nai Brith ont, dès les années trente, critiqué le racisme et l'anti-sémistisme des manuels scolaires des Etats Unis. Parmi les publications les plus récentes, on trouve, par exemple, celle de Katz (1970) sur le traitement des minorités dans les manuels de sciences sociales américains, ou celle de McDiarmid et Pratt (1971) sur les préjugés transmis par les manuels de sciences sociales autorisés dans les écoles secondaires de l'Ontario. En France, Preiswer et Perrot (1975) ont étudié les représentations de l'Afrique, de l'Amérique indienne et de l'Asie, terres coloniales ou quasi-coloniales, dans les manuels scolaires occidentaux. Au Québec, Vincent et Arcand (1979) ont montré que les Amérindiens et les Inuits n'étaient présentés dans les manuels scolaires français qu'en fonction des préoccupations et des perceptions des Blancs. Enfin, de très nombreuses études, telle par exemple celle commandée par le Conseil du statut de la femme du Québec à Lise Dunnigan (1976), portent sur les stéréotypes dont sont victimes cet autre groupe, numériquement majoritaire, mais en situation de pouvoir minoritaire*, les femmes. Toutes ces études constituent un constat souvent choquant, mais peu d'entre elles expliquent les fonctions de ces préjugés et stéréotypes. Les manuels scolaires reflètent sans doute largement la culture dominante, mais ils servent aussi à former les générations futures, et les idéologies et images qu'ils transmettent, consciemment ou non, peuvent avoir une certaine importance sur les enfants, importance qui a rarement été étudiée. Idéologies et images peuvent également servir à justifier la discrimination et les brimades dont sont victimes les membres de cultures dominées.

Une certaine réaction s'est produite: on a tenté de modifier la présentation de ces groupes dans les manuels et dans les classes. Cette modification a ceux buts majeurs, nous semble-t-il: d'une part, en soulignant la valeur des autres cultures, changer les attitudes et les comportements des enfants du groupe majoritaire, en les rendant moins racistes; d'autre part, donner aux enfants des groupes minoritaires une meilleure image d'eux-mêmes et une vue plus valorisante de leur histoire et de leur condition présente. L'entreprise a souvent consisté à souligner le rôle de certains membres d'un groupe minoritaire: on a ainsi montré que l'histoire officielle avait occulté la présence et l'influence de Noirs, ou de femmes. On a souvent tenté de "retrouver" des savants, des peintres, des intellectuels, membres du groups minoritaire. Cette approche nous semble utile, car elle modifie et réécrit une histoire souvent partiale, mais elle nous semble aussi comporter certains dangers. En effet, il y a "objectivement", moins de femmes, ou de Noirs, qui ont été de grands savants, ou de grands artistes, ou de grands héros, dans notre type de société, même si on en "découvre" ou "redécouvre" quelques uns ou quelques unes, et les enfants risquent souvent de faire cette constatation d'eux-mêmes. Il nous semblerait nécessaire de modifier légèrement l'approche, en soulignant pourquoi femmes, Noirs, ou autres membres de groupes minoritaires, n'ont pu s'exprimer aussi facilement

dans divers domaines que les hommes de race blanche dans nos types de société. On pourrait aussi souligner que la notion de "personnage important", de "héros" et "d'héroisme" est sans doute liée à la culture occidentale et remplit certaines fonctions sociales comme, par exemple, exclure de l'histoire "officielle" certains groupes. Une telle approche est celle, par exemple, de l'histoire officielle marxiste des pays dits socialistes, mais il nous semble que le concept du "héros" reste présent dans cette histoire, et qu'on assiste à un simple retournement, où le Peuple devient une entité et le nouveau héros, et où les anciens héros sont le plus souvent dénigrés. Plus réaliste nous semble être la tendance de l'historiographie sociale française contemporaine, dans la lignée de Marc Bloch et de l'Ecole des Annales, qui examine le passé de toute la communauté, et en particulier du petit peuple, et dont Emmanuel Le Roy-Ladurie est peut-être l'un des représentants les plus connus. Une telle approche permet de découvrir d'autres héros et héroïnes ceux et celles de la vie quotidienne, mais elle risque d'être profondément subversive en amenant les enfants, leurs parents et leurs maîtres, à découvrir des injustices et à remettre en question idéologies et structures sociales passées et présentes.

ii. Problems provenant de la diversité dans l'éducation interculturelle et multiculturelle.

Une autre tentative d'éducation interculturelle et multiculturelle a consisté en diverses tentatives d'adapter structures et pratiques de l'école aux enfants de cultures autres que la culture dominante.

Il faut noter d'abord que de telles tentatives sont en général assez récentes. certains systémes ont cependant reconnu, de fait, l'existence de la diversité. Le cas de la France, pays doué d'un système scolaire centralisé, neutre et laïc, mais qui respecte de fait un calendrier chrétien, est intéressant: certaines écoles jouissent d'un calendrier scolaire modifié en raison de la religion de la majorité des enfants les fréquentant. L'école de la Place des Vosges, à Paris, par exemple, située dans un quartier comprenant une forte proportion d'Israélites, avait, dès le début du vingtième siècle, supprimé les classes le samedi, jour du Sabbat, pour les mettre le jeudi, jour libéré pour le catéchisme dans les autres écoles.[9] Ces arrangements institutionnels ont souvent été laissés au bon vouloir des administrateurs. Face à la bénévolence du système français, on pourrait citer au contraire le cas du système québécois, où les Juifs ne furent acceptés dans le système anglo-protestant que de fort mauvaise grâce (Kage, 1975) et où, actuellement, les tentatives de parents d'obtenir des écoles pluralistes reflétant les valeurs diverses d'une certaine communauté ont été contrecarrées. L'aspect institutionnel et politique n'est donc pas toujours négligeable; il est sans doute plus flagrant pour le Québec, où la confessionnalité du système public exclut de nombreux enfants ou les placent dans une situation pour le moins ambiguë et difficile, comme le prouve le débat actuel autour de la déconfessionnalisation d'une école, Notre-Dame-des-Neiges (Durand, Durand, Proulx et Proulx, 1980).[10]

Le Québec a offert une solution originale à ces problèmes institutionnels, que nous avons résumés comme un "multiculturalisme de fait" (Laferrière 1980): le gouvernement du Québec et son Ministère de l'Education subventionnent les écoles privées, pourvu qu'elles suivent le programme d'éducation du Québec. Or ces écoles sont souvent des écoles religieuses ou ethniques: on assiste donc au financement d'écoles ethniques privées sur des fonds publics. Ces écoles permettent certainement la continuation des cultures ethniques et font l'envie de nombreux groupes ethniques hors du Québec. Elles nous

semblent cependant renforcer un phénomène de "ghettoisation" déjà très poussé à Montréal, où on retrouve la quasi totalité des immigrants. Une telle politique pose aussi de façon indirecte le problème de l'adaptation social des membres des cultures autres; doit-on isoler, afin de renforcer leur culture, ou au contraire les intégrer au sein du groupe dominant, tout en les respectant?

D'autres programmes visent, surtout dans le cas d'enfants nouveaux-venus, à faciliter l'adaptation des élèves. Les classes d'accueil, dans de nombreux pays, visent, par exemple, à aider les enfants immigrants. Ces classes cependant souvent privilégient l'enseignement de la langue du pays, sous-entendant que la langue est le moyen d'accès à la culture de ce pays (Laferrière, 1981 à paraître, pour le Québec, par exemple). De plus, les classes d'accueil sont sans doute nécessaires, mais impliquent souvent une certaine assimilation culturelle plus qu'un respect des cultures "autres". Des programmes de type "éducation compensatoire" visent aussi à combler les différences culturelles entre enfants de ces cultures "autres" et enfants du groupe majoritaire. Mais ces programmes entraînent souvent une stigmatisation des enfants, qui sont alors considérés comme "anormaux", c'est à dire hors d'une certaine norme culturelle, et comme devant être "normalisés", remis dans cette norme. De plus ces programmes ont pour but ultime une acculturation à la culture majoritaire, tout comme les classes d'accueil, et ne mènent pas à une véritable éducation interculturelle.

iii. Favoriser et respecter les cultures d'origine.

Le troisième type de tentative d'éducation multiculturelle vise à respecter et favoriser les cultures d'origine des différents enfants.

Ces programmes ont très souvent été le fait d'abord des groupes ethniques ou raciaux minoritaires eux-mêmes: écoles du samedi ou du dimanche, cours après l'école publique, et, dans certains cas, tentatives de créer un réseau propre d'écoles ethniques ou religieuses ont eu pour but de renforcer la communauté minoritaire. Ces tentatives ont, depuis quelques années, été encouragées par les pouvoirs publics. Au Canada, le multiculturalisme, idéologie et pratique officielles, ont permis la subvention par les autorités fédérales, et par certaines autorités provinciales, de programmes ethniques (Burnet, 1979). En Europe occidentale, les pays hôtes et les pays d'origine ont parfois collaboré pour mettre sur pied des programmes pour les enfants de travailleurs migrants. Ces programmes ne sont pas toujours exempts de vues intéressées: les pays d'origine tâchent de maintenir un certain contrôle politique et social sur leurs ressortissants, tandisque les pays hôte, particulièrement depuis la crise économique, cherchent à prévoir, et même d'encourager, le retour de certain nombre de travailleurs à leurs pays d'origine.[11] Aux Etats Unis, la plupart des systèmes scolaires et des institutions d'enseignement supérieur offrent des cours pour et sur les groupes minoritaires: "Black Studies" pour les Noirs, "Chicano Studies" et "Porto Rican Studies" pour Mexicains Américains et Porto Ricains, etc. . . .

La plupart de ces programmes, même s'ils portent des noms différents, sont caractérisés par des pratiques communes: apprentissage de la langue d'origine du groupe d'origine.

Ces programmes sont souvent, mais pas toujours, reçus avec grand interêt par les membres des cultures "autres", mais ils nous semblent tout de même présenter certains problèmes, toujours liés à la notion de culture et à ses ambiguïtés.

On peut tout d'abord se demander quel est le contenu des programmes mis en oeuvre: quelle est donc la culture d'origine, et qui la définit? Cette définition peut être le fait soit de la culture dominante, soit du groupe impliqué lui-même, soit, dans le cas des groupes d'origine immigrante, d'une autre société. Dans ces trois cas, nous assistons à une certaine unification de la culture à transmettre, car les trois groupes définisseurs, n'ont, le plus souvent, aucun intérêt à souligner dissensions et divisions. Le pays dominant, ou pays d'accueil dans le cas des immigrants, a le plus souvent intérêt à définir de la façon la plus simple possible une culture "autre" et y est aidé par certains stéréotypes et préjugés. Le pays d'origine a aussi intérêt à souligner son unité, tout comme le groupe culturel organisé dans un pays hôte, car, si l'union fait la force, il est plus facile, et politiquement plus sûr, de représenter tout le groupe. On arrive souvent à des déclarations du type "les Grecs", ou "Les Italiens", ou "les Américains" du Canada veulent. . . . Cette unification est souvent factice, et la notion de culture commune peut servir à occulter des divisions dans le groupe culturel. Ces divisions peuvent venir d'anciennes divisions historiques (et en particulier de divisions existant dans les pays d'origine pour les immigrants: divisions religieuses, régionales, ou idéologiques; elles peuvent également refléter des divisions des classes sociales actuelles. L'unicité de la culture d'un groupe peut donc masquer ces divisions et offrir une vue unique d'un groupe en fait multiple. Il y a de fortes chances, par exemple, que des travailleurs d'origine grecque ou italienne et d'idéologie socialiste ou communiste au Canada n'aient pas les mêmes vues sur la société canadienne et sur la Grèce que les membres de l'Association des hommes d'Affaires ou l'église catholique italienne ou grecque orthodoxe. L'idée d'une culture unique, acceptée par tous, sert cependant à quelque chose: unifier, ou donner l'idée d'un groupe culturel unique, qui serait dirigé par certains interlocuteurs, les "dirigeants" ou "l'élite" ethnique ou culturelle. Il y aurait ainsi une certaine collusion, consciente ou non, entre diverses élites, celles de la société globale et celle du groupe culturel.[12]

Un autre aspect de l'éducation interculturelle telle qu'elle est trop souvent conçue nous semble dangereux pour les groupes culturels "autres". Cette éducation risque, en fait, de limiter et installer dans un ghetto les enfants des cultures "autres." Cette éducaton serait elle aussi ethnocentrique, et valoriserait aux dépens des autres groupes le groupe d'appartenance de l'enfant. L'idée selon laquelle il faut d'abord être conscient et fier de son propre groupe pour accepter les autres est une extrapolation psycho-sociologique des études américaines sur la personnalité autoritaire: on a déduit, du fait que les individus peu sûrs d'eux étaient de tendance "fasciste", que l'incertitude liée à l'absence de culture de référence menait à l'autoritarisme, sans qu'aucune étude empirique sérieuse le prouve.[13] De la même façon, l'enfermement possible dans un ghetto culturel créé, par exemple, par les écoles ethniques, n'a pas été envisagé. Cet enfermement nous semble avoir un aspect psychologique, puisqu'il implique une certaine fermeture aux autres et un ethnocentrisme culturel de la part des cultures "autres": Burnet (1979:55) a été l'un des rares auteurs à souligner que les enfants des groupes minoritaires pouvaient, eux aussi, faire preuve de racisme. Cet enfermement peut aussi avoir des conséquences sociales: en empêchant les enfants des cultures "autres" de connaître la culture dominante, on les enferme dans leur propre culture et les empêche d'entrer en compétition. Cela permet ainsi le maintien de la domination de "l'élite" ethnique ou culturelle, et la justification, par la société globale, l'échec des groupes culturels "autres". Cette "ghettoisation" justifiant l'échec et le provoquant peut devenir l'une des

nombreuses façons de "blamer la victime", pour reprendre de titre de l'ouvrage de Ryan (1971) examinant ces processus.

Conclusion

Nous avons souligné ici la possibilité de certaines conséquences inattendues, "effets pervers" (Boudon, 1977) que peuvent entraîner certaines politiques éducatives visant à une plus grande compréhension entre diverses cultures. Mal conçues, ces politiques risquent d'aboutir à des résultats contraires aux buts recherchés: isolement, "ghettoisation", domination par une certaine élite, ethnocentrisme et rejet par le groupe majoritaire. Il semble, en conclusion, que l'on ne puisse, comme Mauviel (1979) que souhaiter une éducation non plus multiculturelle ou seulement interculturelle, mais véritablement transculturelle, où les échanges entre les divers groupes existeraient véritablement, dans un respect mutuel. Un premier pas dans cette direction serait, par exemple, d'ouvrir les cours de langues et de culture à tous, quelle que soit leur origine: cela se fait, mais dans quelques cas rares. Une autre tentative, partiellement réalisée cella-là, serait d'introduire dans le système scolaire, et pour tous les enfants, idées et pratiques montrant la relativité des diverses cultures et la valeur propre de chacune. Sans doute faudrait-il aussi reconnaître la valeur de différents groupes sociaux: groupes ethniques, raciaux, culturels, mais aussi classes sociales. On pourrait rêver d'un multiculturalisme qui serait aussi un multiculturalisme de classe, mais un tel rêve suppose des bouleversements que l'on ne peut demander au seul système éducatif d'entreprendre.

* Cette communication est issue du travail préparatoire du Projet F.C.A.C. sur l'éducation des Minorités (PREM/MFRP) que l'auteur dirige à l'Université McGill. L'auteur seul est responsable des vues présentées ici; ses idées n'engagent ni le Projet, ni l'Université McGill, ni l'organisme subventionnaire (Programme F.C.A.C., Direction Générale de l'Enseignement Supérieur, Ministère de l'Education du Québec).

(1) Nous employons intentionnellement le terme vague "d'idée", car nous ne pensons pas avoir affaire à un concept, et nous ne voulons pas utiliser le terme théoriquement discutable, et souvent politiquement chargé, d'idéologie.

(2) On pourrait, bien entendu, citer quelques cas où on a pu connaître les idéologies et les attitudes de certains peuples en contact avec les Européens, grâce à certains Européens, comme Las Casas en Amérique du Sud, ou les Jésuites et leurs *Relations* en Nouvelle France. On peut aussi faire quelques inférences à partir du comportement de ces peuples, comme par exemple les résistances que les "guerres indiennes" aux Etats Unis indiquent, ou comme certaines traces, telles par exemple les représentations souvent peu flatteuses des Européens que l'on trouve dans certaines statuaires africaines ou mélanésiennes.

(3) Il faut mentionner en passant certaines études et réactions niant l'importance de l'école comme instrument de mobilité sociale ou de maintien du statu quo, que ce soit d'un point de vue psycho-sociologique, comme celle de Jencks et al. (1972), ou structurel, comme celle de Boudon (1973), par exemple.

(4) La notion de "melting pot" a été, par exemple, illustrée et défendue dès 1902 dans une pièce du même titre, écrite par un immigrant juif, et qui vantait ce nouvel Américain et s'opposait ainsi indirectement au nativisme blanc, protestant et anglosaxon.

(5) Tel est le cas du Québec, par exemple, où le Ministère de l'Education a créé un Projet d'enseignement en langue d'origine (PELO) visant à permettre l'alphabétisation dans leur langue des enfants de divers groupes d'origine immigrante (Laferrière, 1981 à paraître).

(6) Nous mettons "haute" entre guillemets pour indiquer que nous répétons des convictions communément répandues, auxquelles nous ne souscrivons pas forcément.

(7) Voir, par exemple, l'histoire de cette fondation et de différents concepts offerts par Harris (1968) et la tentative théorique de ce même auteur de fonder un "matérialisme culturel" (Harris, 1979).

(8) La notion de groupe minoritaire implique en effet non seulement une infériorité numérique (au niveau d'un pays, car très souvent le groupe dit minoritaire est majoritaire dans une certaine région) mais surtout une certaine impuissance sociale, comme l'a souligné, par exemple, Blalock (1967).

(9) Il n'existe pas de documentation officielle sur cette école, et nous voudrions remercier Mme Laferriere-Zaremberg de nous avoir fourni des informations quant aux débuts des modifications de cette école du "Marais" de Paris.

(10) Dans ce cas, les parents d'un Comité d'école avaient demandé que l'école devienne pluraliste, au niveau religieux, et que les enfants sans religion, ou d'une religion autre que la religion catholique, soient éduqués ensemble, sauf aux heures d'éducation religieuse. La Commission des Ecoles Catholiques de Montréal a refusé et a eu gain de cause, pour des raisons constitutionnelles, en ce qui concerne les cours.

(11) Il existe des différences entre pays. Les Britanniques, par exemple, refusent, pour des raisons politiques, l'emploi du terme "migrant" pour adopter "immigrant".

(12) Il faut souligner d'ailleurs que la constitution de cette élite vient souvent du fait que la société globale lui a refusé l'accès à ses institutions politiques et sociales. L'élite ethnique s'appuie sur son groupe, qui est la seule force lui permettant de devenir une élite (Laferrière, 1979, pour les noirs à Montréal, par exemple).

(13) De nombreuses études sur le racisme, par exemple, montrent que les immigrants sont racistes, tout comme les gens les moins éduqués, mais ces études, menées par questionnaires, examinent les perceptions, sans prendre en compte le fait que les gens éduqués répondent différemment et savent qu'il est mal de s'affirmer raciste.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE DES OUVRAGES CITES:

Blalock, Hubert M. Jr.
1967 *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Boudon, Raymond
1973 *L'inégalité des chances. La mobilité sociale dans les societés industrielles*. Paris: Armand Colin.
1977 *Effets pervers et ordre social*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Burnet, Jean
1979 "Myths and Multiculturalism", *Canadian Journal of Education*, IV, 4:43-58.

Dunnigan, Lise
1976 *Analyse des stéréotypes masculins et féminins dans les manuels scolaires au Québec*. Québec: Editeur officiel.

Durand, Jocelyne, Guy Durand, Lucie Proulx et Jean-Pierre Proulx
1980 *La Déconfessionnalisation de l'école (ou le cas Notre-Dame-des-Neiges)*. Montréal: Editions Libre Expression.

Harris, Marvin
1968 *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. New York: Harper and Row.
1979 *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture*. New York: Random House.

Hawkins, Freda
1972 *Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern*. Montréal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Jencks, Christopher et al.
1972 *Inequality. A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kage, Joseph.
1975 "The Education of a Minority: Jewish Children of Greater Montreal" in Mingus, Paul, ed. *Sounds Canadian. Language and Cultures in Multi-Ethnic Society*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates: 93-104.

Katz, Michael B.
1970 *Minorities in Textbooks: A Study of Their Treatment in Social Studies Texts*. New York: Watts, Franklin Inc.

Laferrière, Michel
1979 "La 'non-participation politique' des Noirs à Montréal". Communication à la réunion bi-annuelle de la Société canadienne des études ethniques, Vancouver.
1980 "Education and Multiculturalism in Québec: Attitudes and Policies" in McLeod, Keith A. ed. *International Education and Community Development*. Toronto: Guidance Centre, Faculty of Education, University of Toronto: 28-36.
1981 "Language and Cultural Programmes for Ethnic Minorities in Québec: A Critical View", *Multiculturalism*, à paraître.

Levine, Donald M. et Mary Jo Bane, eds.
1975 *The "Inequality" Controversy: Schooling and Distributive Justice*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Mauviel, Maurice
1979 "Plaidoyer pour une éducation transculturelle" *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, No 49:21-33.

McDiarmid, Garnett et David Pratt
1971 *Teaching Prejudice: A Content Analysis of Social Studies Textbooks Authorized for Use in Ontario*. Toronto: OISE.

Palmer, Howard, ed.
1974 *Immigration and the Rise of Multiculturalism*. Toronto: Copp Clark.

Porter, John
1965 *The Vertical Mosaic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Preiswer, Roy A. et Dominique Perrot
1975 *Ethnocentrisme et histoire: l'Afrique, l'Amérique indienne et l'Asie dans les manuels occidentaux*. Paris: Anthropos.

Ryan, William
1971 *Blaming the Victim*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Spector, Malcolm et John L. Kitsuse
Constructing Social Problems. Menlo Park, Calif.: Cummings.

Tapinos, George P.
L'immigration étrangère en France (Cahier de l'INED No 71). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Vernet, Madeleine
L'Arc-en-ciel. Contes pour la réconciliation. Levallois-Perret (France): Editions de la Mère éducatrice.

Vincent, Sylvie et Bernard Arcand
1979 *L'image de l'Amérindien dans les manuels scolaires de Québec*. Ville Lasalle (Québec): Cahiers du Québec/Hurtubise HMH, Collection Cultures amérindiennes.

Comparative Perspectives on Multicultural Education

Vandra Lea Masemann
University of Toronto

Cette communication a pour but de situer la discussion de l'éducation multiculturelle dans un cadre théorique et comparatif plus large — un cadre dérivé de perspectives sociologiques et philosophiques. Les exemples qui illustrent cette approche sont basés sur la politique multiculturelle de plusieurs pays. Le premier sujet traite du type de sociétés dans lesquels le multiculturalisme est concevable comme politique — des états-nations industriels et pluralistes du point de vue ethnologique tels que le Canada, les Etats-Unis, l'Australie, l'Israël, et la Grande Bretagne. La deuxième question est la suivante: quelle culture est transmise par les écoles? Dans une discussion du concepte de Gramsci sur "l'hégémonie culturelle", l'auteur propose que les groupes ethniques peuvent avoir une optique mondiale non-officielle qui ne s'accrédite pas dans les écoles. Les réalités des moyens de pression parmi les groupes culturels et les implications pour le contrôle et la mise en oeuvre du programme d'études sont discutées. On aborde la question de l'existence de la "haute culture". La dernière partie comprend une discussion de la manière dont on présente le programme d'études multiculturelles dans les écoles. A cause de la fragmentation du programme d'études et l'enlèvement du contrôle culturel, les études multiculturelles conviennent le mieux aux programme d'études des écoles qui organisent l'instruction dans les intérêts de la majorité dominante.

The purpose of this paper is to put multicultural education into a broad theoretical and comparative framework. The attempt may pose more questions than it answers, but it is written from the viewpoint that multicultural education needs to be placed within a framework of discussion that ties it into a wider theoretical context which derives from the social sciences and philosophy. The current plethora of platitudes about "unity in diversity" or "improved intercultural understanding" or "transcending our differences" needs to be examined as cultural products of particular types of societies at particular places and times. Within such a framework, multicultural education becomes a particular response to a particular set of conditions, rather than an anticipated palliative for society's ills.

This paper will advance a theoretical analysis which relies on the work of critical sociologists, anthropologists and philosophers. It will take examples from a variety of countries to illustrate such perspectives. Attempts to develop multicultural curricula and approaches to education in Canada, the United States, Australia, Great Britain, Israel, or elsewhere will be examined from a set of theoretical perspectives from which knowledge itself is seen as a social product which can be tailored to suit the needs of dominant groups, in part, as an appeasement to members of racial or ethnic minorities. When multicultural education is seen in this perspective, one must look beyond the brightly-coloured posters of ethnically diverse children waving flags to the core of meaning in the power relationships of the groups in the national society.

In What Kinds of Societies is Multicultural Education Conceivable?

It is noteworthy in the last ten or fifteen years how many politicians and educators in industrial (or post-industrial) societies with substantial immigrant populations have come

to *think* the multicultural *thought*. It is expressed in very recognizable ways in the official documents of many countries. In Canada, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism expresses it thus:

> Acculturation is inevitable in a multi-ethnic country like Canada, and the two main societies themselves are open to its influence. The integration of immigrants into the life of the country, with the help of its institutions, is surely the road to their self-fulfilment. But in this process of adopting fully the Canadian way of life, sharing its advantages and disadvantages, those whose origin is neither French nor British do not have to cast off or hide their own culture. It may happen that in their determination to express their desire to live more fully in this mode, their culture may conflict with the customs of their adopted society. But Canadian society, open and modern, should be able to integrate heterogeneous elements into a harmonious system, to achieve "unity in diversity."[1]

Such a thought is echoed in the Australian Commonwealth Education Portfolio paper on education in a multicultural Australia:

> The group uses the term multiculturalism to describe an ideal society where goups would co-exist harmoniously, free to maintain many of their distinctive religious, linguistic, or social customs, equal in their access to resources and services, civil rights and political power, and sharing with the rest of the society particular concerns and values, which have national significance. There would be diversity, equality, and interaction through sharing. Ideally each group would have members distributed over the socio-economic range so that each individual would have opportunities for both upward, downward and lateral social mobility. . . . . In such a society, the individual would be free to retain most of his ethnic loyalties . . . . . but these would be seen as complementary to, not in conflict with, the loyalties he shares with other Australians, and which form his identity as an Australian.[2]

With regard to the American situation, similar ways of seeing the problem are presented in the revised NCATE Standards of Accreditation of Teacher Education.

> Multicultural education is preparation for the social, political, and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have both national and international dimensions. This preparation provides a process by which an individual develops competencies for perceiving, believing, evaluating and behaving in different cultural settings. Thus, multicultural education is viewed as an intervention and an on-going assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society.[3]

In the case of Israel, the situation is somewhat more complex, but the language used to describe it rings with the same multicultural tones:

> The new policy is based on a new look at concepts such as "Jewish Cultural Heritage" and "National Unity." It tries to convince teachers — and through a consistent program of education, the nation at large — that "Jewish" is not the same as "Ashkenazi" (comparable to the rejection of "Anglo-Conformity" in the U.S.) but includes all Jewish groups, at all periods, and in all places; that "unity" is not necessarily the same as "uniformity"; that differences between ethnic groups are both natural and legitimate; and that national unity is not threatened by some measure of cultural diversity.[4]

In Britain by 1971 the Department of Education and Science was claiming:

> Schools can demonstrate how people from different ethnic groups and cultural backgrounds can live together happily and successfully, and can help to create the kind of cohesive, multi-cultural society on which the future of this country — and possibly the world — depends.[5]

What kinds of states are these, which could all propound a seemingly similar policy? First, these are nation-states that have a common constitutional and legal system within

which peoples of diverse ethnicities and races may live as citizens. Thus the emphasis on national identity is not lost in the message of multiculturalism, but it is seen as having a new shape, or new facets. In Canada, the case is complicated by a constitution which ensures, albeit not uniformly across the country, language rights for two kinds of Canadians, English and French. However, the question behind all of these multicultural policies is "What is national identity, and how do we conceive of it?" In common parlance one hears this as "What is a *real* Canadian? or Australian?" The reality of diversity somehow has to be brought into the definition for it to be valid in ethnically and racially diverse societies.

Second, these are states which are considered to be liberal democracies, in which the definition of citizenship is based on notions of individual rights and responsibilities. No longer are people considered to be fettered by the "primordial and irrational ties"[6] of culture, but their way of life has now been transformed into a "life-style", which is a matter of choice. Thus, too, ethnic and to some extent racial affiliation have been turned into "labels" which have their uses in the appropriate situation.[7] The "hyphenated Canadian" child may go to public school in the week and to ancestral language classes on the weekend. Ethnic affiliation may be a useful label to acknowledge when one attends the local church, but a disadvantage in the search for housing or employment (human rights codes notwithstanding). Similarly, school boards in the United States may count Hispanic children as black or white, depending on the use to which statistics are put. Immigration statistics can be distorted similarly. In one case, a student at the University of Toronto recently met a black immigrant from St. Lucia whose mother was of French and African descent, and whose father was Welsh. In the Canadian immigration statistics, he was classified as a white because of his Welsh father.

In any event, such liberal conceptions of citizenship and identity render identity and loyalty much more malleable concepts than in pre-industrial, tribal, or strongly hierarchical or authoritarian societies. When they are associated with the immigrant experience, the third common feature in such societies, they become part of the immigrants' dream of occupational success for themselves and educational hopes for their children. It is at this point that the schools are looked to with such fervour as the purveyors of the new learning which will make such a future possible for the next generation.[8] Thus arises the faith in multicultural education.

A fourth feature of such societies is their basic disregard of indigenous or caste-like minorities who do not appear to be accepting the liberal definition of individualism, occupational mobility, and citizenship on the terms of the dominant group.[9] In policy documents on multiculturalism, the emphasis is generaly on charter or immigrant groups, with caste-like minorities either receding into a historical backdrop (e.g. North American native peoples) or disappearing into the hinterland (e.g. Australian aborigines). Minority groups which present particularly "difficult" problems in assimilation as in the case of gypsies (the Rom) in Europe or Palestinian refugees in camps in Israel are often simply ignored in the multicultural literature, while the emphasis is placed on the "less difficult" grous. In Australia, the emphasis in the Report of the Committee on Multicultural Education to the Schools Commission is on such groups. Australian history is summed up in these two paragraphs:

> 2.2 Australia has always been a multicultural society. Even before the European settlement the continent was inhabited by the Aboriginal groups each with their own distinct and different languages and culture.

2.3 With the English colonisation of the continent and thereafter, people from different cultures arrived and settled. The record of Australia's early history and its exploration is studded with the names of people whose backgrounds were not English. Since the large-scale migration program following the end of the Second World War over three million immigrants have come to settle in Australia. Of this total over one third has come from non-English speaking countries.[10]

The Report continues on the assumption that multicultural education is the relevant policy for immigrants; reference to Aborigines after this point is scant. Indeed the Report sees a "common thread" within Australian society of "a belief in parliamentary democracy, in equality of opportunity, in educational and economic activity and the right to a private life and choice of occupation."[11]

This latter quote sums up the kinds of beliefs which support the concept of multiculturalism. They are the context within which multiculturalism is conceivable. The questions that arise now are ones that refer to the extent to which such a thought is promulgated throughout the society. Whose knowledge is multiculturalism? Who thinks it is a good thing? Who does not think so? How does it get into the schools? Whose knowledge is it when it is in the schools? Whose culture is taught in the schools? What culture is brought home from school? What culture is taken to school? The remainder of this paper will argue that ethnic cultures become fragmented in the multicultural curriculum; certain fragments become legitimate knowledge and others do not; that multicultural "culture" is transmitted along the same class and ethnic lines as it has always been; and that still the same kinds of children emerge the winners, the bearers of the culture that gains univeristy entrance and occupational success.

Whose Culture do the Schools Transmit?

The multicultural literature makes little reference to cultural hegemony,[12] but the concept has everything to do with multicultural education. It is commonplace to assert that schools are purveyors of the received knowledge and ideas of the ruling class which are transmitted via the middle class teaching profession. Madeleine MacDonald discusses Gramsci's notion of hegemony as:

> a whole range of structures and activities, as well as values, attitudes, beliefs and morality that in various ways support the established order and the class interests which dominate it. The concept of hegemony refers to the organizing principle or world view which is diffused through agencies of ideological control and socialization into every area of daily life. It provides the fundamental categories of thought and perception of the social world which bind individuals together in one society.[13]

However she points out that hegemonic control, although pervasive, is never total because the dominated groups are still able to hold their own "unofficial" view of the material and symbolic world, grounded in ther own experience of the material world. Her discussion centres mainly on the potential class conflict in such a situation, in which the working class has the potential to produce a *counter hegemony*, or alternative world view.[14] Ultimately Gramsci saw the transcedence of class divisions as possible, not by diversifying curricula, courses, or types of schools, but by creating "a single type of formative school which would take the child up to the threshold of his choice of job, forming him during this time as a person capable of thinking, studying, and ruling — or controlling those who rule."[15]

These arguments can be transferred from class to ethnicity. If the dominant cultural

group in a society is having its culture purveyed in the schools (WASP Canadians, Ashkenazi Jews, British colonizers in Africa and Asia), then it is entirely possible, and has become evident, that the other ethnic groups have continued to hold their "unofficial" view of the world. This is easier to do when the ethnic group has remained as a group. Certain groups such as the Hutterites and Amish have fought for their right to hold such views. However, in the United States, for example, the rights were upheld by the very constitution which was forcing them to violate their religious consciences by sending their adolescents to school.[16] When members of ethnic groups have dispersed and consider themselves to be individuals, it is more difficult for them or their children to retain such unofficial views in the face of teacher and peer pressure to conform. The Toronto Board of Education's Task Force on multiculturalism found much evidence of individual anguish while at school, but enduring ethnic "unofficial" strength out of school.[17] However, the result of many briefs, discussions, and demands from ethnic minorities did not result in any amendment to the Ontario Education Act with regard to languages of instruction. Instead, a Heritage Language Program was introduced which allowed two and a half hours of ancestral language programming during or after school, or on Saturday mornings.[18]

If one pursues the argument further, ethnic groups may hold to their unofficial view, particularly in conjunction with religion (as with the Polish community in Buffalo, or Ukrainians of Eastern Rite in Toronto). However, whether they have the possibility of producing a counter hegemony is most unlikely. The case closest to this possibility probably lies in Canada, in the province of Quebec. Under the provisions of the British North America Act, the rights of the French in Canada are guaranteed in regard to language, education, law, and religion. These rights refer to institutions which Gramsci would call "civil", a domain which he considers no less important than the "political" in the exercise of cultural hegemony. In the case of Quebec, the independent use of political, economic and military power is all that is lacking for statehood.

However, such an analysis implies that Canada is composed of two equally powerful and potentially independent cultural groups, when in fact the dominating English group is itself not politically or economically (or even psychologically) independent of Great Britain, as evidenced in the many decades of Anglo-centred curriculm up until post-1945 or in the current Constitutional discussion. Moreover, that same group is now culturally dominated by the United States, particularly in regard to economics and the mass media. Curriculum developments in the schools are often predicated on American research (e.g. DISTAR, or special education), with the very felicitious exception of second language immersion programs in which the Americans are setting up St. Lambert experiments of their own.[19]

Thus any discussion of multicultural educational policy in Canada exists in a situation where cultural hegemony is ultimately exercised through American or to some extent British and French sources. The current attempt to introduce Canadian Studies[20] into the schools is itself an attempt to assert some sort of Canadian "official" view to counter the pervasive multinational view. Philip Altbach has discussed this problem in relation to scholarly publishing in the Third World, in which small local presses generally print local, internal material whereas scholars look to large British and American presses to publish their prestigious articles on which academic legitimation and job promotion rest.[21] There exists a similar situation in Canada, with scholars publishing in the

prestigious American or British journals, and with school textbooks being produced for Canadian schools by American-owned publishing houses.

It is not suggested that Canadian school and curriculum materials produced by Americans necessarily lack Canadian content, but in many cases it is merely inserted into or replacing some materials produced for an international market. A recent example is the MacMillan Children's Dictionary.[22] Moreover, the argument can be advanced that curriculum materials should have international content, so that children no longer hold to local, parochial beliefs. However, international content that is all produced in Washington or Toronto or London (perhaps even with the help of overseas advisors) is not the same as international content that comes from the bearers of the culture. A recent article in the *New York Times* points to the necessity for a new World Information Order, since 90% of all international news is carried through the four largest wire services.[23]

These facts are not irrelevant in the analysis of the possibilities in multicultural education. When cultural hegemony is exercised by wire services, publishing houses, and large corporations such as SRA Associates who produce curriculum materials, then it can surely be said that the schools transmit a culture often produced elsewhere, but approved of by school administrators for their local populations. In the United States the problem is somewhat less severe, for so much educational material and the educational research that led to it is produced in the United States itself. However, local protests over textbooks have also occurred, in which certain ethnic or religious groups object to the prevailing standards of morality or scientific assumptions in textbooks.

When one asks how this dominant culture flows down through educational channels to the schools, one sees the decisions of school principals, local school administrators and trustees, and in more centralized systems, Ministry of Education officials, as all forming a filter which usually passes the most bland and inoffensive of material and rejects anything volatile or too "unofficial."

Moreover, this filter function may be performed in the schooling process itself. Bourdieu has described the function of schooling in France as creating a system of stratification of cultural capital, in which the members of the elite have the best command of legitimate knowledge (even if it is quaint, by North American standards, with the heavy emphasis on the classics) which will guarantee them access to the Écoles des Hautes Études.[24] Not only do they acquire the content of the curriculum, they also acquire a particular mindset with which to approach knowledge. Members of the less privileged classes may dimly perceive this mind-set, but may never actually acquire it, or else they fail so early in their school career that they are channelled into technical or vocational streams in which other values and approaches to knowledge (e.g. technical or practical) are assumed to be appropriate for those who cannot deal with "high knowledge." Such approaches seem to be legitimate for those who are destined to remain in their social class, but they do not in the eyes of educators constitute a legitimate "unofficial" view, in the way that multicultural policy proponents speak of alternative sets of values in a pluralist society. The same argument can be applied to relativistic views on language or dialect in a country such as France, where the form of the language is protected.

Bourdieu's work raises the question of the extent to which a "high culture" is seen to exist in the eyes of educators, and it also relates directly to Gramsci's espousal of a unitary school system. These discussions are not often held by multicultural policy planners,

for they put strongly into question the "unity in diversity" theme, and also face too squarely the existence of social class differentiation *even* in ethnically pluralist societies.

Harold Entwistle, a scholar of Gramsci, has argued strongly for the acknowledgement of the existence of high culture by educators. By this he refers to the legacy of classical scholars, great musicians, and artists. He argues that the only hope for the working class is not for the curriculum to be differentiated or the classes to be streamed, but for a unitary school system to serve the needs of all, so that members of the working class acquire the knowledge to transcend their class position.[25] This is a complete rejection of the "unity in diversity" theme.

However, in an examination of multicultural policy documents, one sees that the members of ethnic groups are not meant to transcend their ethnicity in terms related only to the educational enterprise itself, but in terms related to national unity or common citizenship (see introduction to this paper). Thus the call for an ethnically or linguistically diversified curriculum is not meant to force students to transcend their ethnic background by, for example, getting high marks or attending university. Indeed, the clarion call is much fainter, and is for an improved inter-cultural understanding or a better self-concept, or a good basic knowledge of the national language. This difference accounts for the relative mildness of tone and limpness of syntax in policy statements for goals in multicultural education programs, even in cities such as Toronto where demands for more far-reaching changes had been made by members of ethnic minority groups:

> . . . the Work Group agrees that the common link between peoples of different cultural and linguistic traditions must be the two official languages of Canada, English and French.
>
> We also accept the idea that in a multicultural society each person has the right to cultural integrity, to a positive self image, and to an understanding of, and respect for, differences.[26]

In the American setting, the goals are likewise vague, and do not confront the class problem in the hopes for "parity of power:"

> Multicultural education [for teachers] could include but not be limited to experiences which: (1) Promote analytical and evaluative abilities to confront issues such as participatory democracy, racism and sexism, and the parity of power; (2) Develop skills for values clarification including the study of the manifest and latent transmission of values; (3) Examine the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing teaching strategies; and (4) Examine linguistic variations and diverse learning styles as a basis for the development of appropriate learning strategies.[27]

The Australian document attempts to overcome all contradictions among class, race, and ethnicity in its proposals for multicultural education:

> All levels in the formal education system have an obligation to promote and teach programs based on the belief that the various cultures represented within the Australian population have something of value to share with others and something of value to learn from others. The organizational structure of schools as well as the educational programs and activities offered, should encourage the development and maintenance of the student's self esteem and personal identity while at the same time offering the opportunity for the student to understand and appreciate life styles and cultural patterns other than his or her own. These activities need to be carried out in an educational environment which supports social cohesion and fosters equality of educational opportunity.[28]

In the above three quotations is summarized the hope of proponents of multicultural education that "unity in diversity" *and* "equality of opportunity" can co-exist. However, this supposition does not appear to be borne out by the facts. There appears scant evi-

dence that majority/minority access differences to higher education have changed as a result of multicultural education, or that if they had, this would necessarily improve changes of occupational success for members of minorities. In the United States, for example, the worth of a high school or college education for blacks in terms of future yearly income is much less than it is for white males.[29] Thus the mechanisms for equality of opportunity do not necessarily rest within the schools if there is not a direct link between education and occupational success. Moreover, members of some ethnic groups do not see monetary rewards as the ultimate yardstick of success.

The question remains, as to how multicultural education in a class society could overcome this basic contradiction between diversity in ways of being and equality of opportunity as measured by standardized criteria such as academic or occupational success. The answer lies in the particular form that multicultural curriculum takes in the schools.

How is Multicultural Curriculum Taught in the Schools?

To follow the argument concerning cultural hegemony to its logical conclusion, one can argue that the dominant cultural forms in any society are still purveyed even in a multicultural curriculum. The "diversity" of such efforts within the curriculum is quite overshadowed by the "equality" of such forms as testing, tracking, and assessment for entrance to higher education.

As far as multicultural curriculum is concerned, it is all taught within the general framework of the existing educational structures, except in the instance of ethnic-specific education arranged by the ethnic communities themselves. However, the marks and evaluation in such courses do not form part of the general school record of a child. In the case of second or third language programs (such as bilingual education in the United States, or bilingual and ancestral language programs in Canada),[30] the framework of curriculum development, resource preparation, and student assessment is all controlled by the same kinds of regulations that govern teachers in the usual performance of their duties. Small pockets of discretionary powers remain to teachers, particularly in newer programs such as Heritage Language Programs in Ontario. As programs develop and are formalized, standards of accreditation for teachers become more stringent (as in the most recent U.S. Bilingual Education Act), and standards of assessment of students more nearly approach those in the more established programs.

The implications of these processes for true "diversity" in curriculum content or orientation are profound. There is a constant push toward the dominant cultural forms in evaluation and assessment regardless of the content of the program and its avowed goals.[31] Examples can be drawn from many sources. For non-English-speaking immigrants to Canada, Great Britain, and Australia, the dominant form of "cultural diversity" is ESL classes. The same Australian document that so fervently supports "cultural diversity" proclaims its limits:

> The key to a large number of options in Australian society is competence in English. . . . The teaching of English is the major element in a language program.[32]

This same emphasis on ESL is found in the final report of the Toronto Board of Education's Work Group on Multicultural Programs. As has been argued elsewhere, the "sympathetic ESL model" found a far more favourable reception as a program for easing immigrant students' academic problems than did an "original language and culture

model" that would have laid much heavier emphasis, at least initially, on the child's ancestral language.[33]

Moreover, for the first time courts in the United States have found an ESL program to be adequate fulfilment of the *Lau* regulations which have formerly involved bilingual education for children of limited English speaking ability.[34] The problem is further complicated by the position of English as an international *lingua franca*, for example in the European Common Market.

Another example of the strength of dominant cultural forms is the functioning of programs in education of native peoples in Canada and the United States. There is now a quite considerable anthropological and psychological literature on cultural differences in the teaching/learning situation, and in perception and cognition in general[35] Many native children are exposed to what Bourdieu would call "symbolic violence," even in what the dominant culture would think of as a normal classroom.[36] Yet attempts to establish programs *for* or *by* native peoples immediately run into problems of being labelled peripheral or not up to standard because the very values which lie at the heart of them run counter to the model of education which upholds the standards. For some groups, the answer is control over their own educational system and contact with the white man's world on their own terms. Another alternative is found in guidelines on native education which attempt to bridge the two worlds. The Ontario Ministry of Education document, *People of Native Ancestry*, is such an attempt.[37] Efforts are made to explain the native point of view to non-native teachers and students, and to show how elements of the native viewpoint could be used to enhance the educational experience for native and non-native children. It makes concrete suggestions concerning environmental studies, communications and language, the arts, and curriculum development.

However, this document reveals the process by which ethnically different material is made relevant and meaningful to the mainstream curriculum. This process involves fragmentation and decontextualization of the original culture in order to render it suitable as curriculum material. This is the most prevalent mode of rendering culture fit for use as multicultural curriculum content; the previous discussion has shown that the school model cannot accept material based on assumptions which it does not share. However, a great deal of material can be accommodated if it is a) translated into English and b) fragmented as curriculum content. Joshua Fishman has labelled one such process "thingification," the isolated treatment of cultural objects without a context.[38] Examples such as pizza, sombreros, yodelling, palm trees, kayaks and Brie cheese, are rife in multicultural curricula.

Once this process has taken place, any sort of material can be accommodated for use. Numerous examples can be drawn of cultural content being presented as "diversity" within the dominant cultural framework. American bilingual classrooms for Spanish-speaking children may be run according to the latest research on individualized instruction.[39] German immersion classrooms may use American cartoon characters.[40] Indeed, the same may be true of German classrooms in Germany, where the direction of cultural flow is probably part of the same process. Nonetheless, the cultural contradictions of the diversity theme are muted in the common Snoopy/Charlie Brown motif for a corssword puzzle in any language.

Another example of such curriculum fragmentation is seen in the Heritage Language Programs in Ontario. The attempt is to run a parallel curriculum on topics related to Canada and to the country of origin. Thus the housing, yearly seasons, national heroes,

and places of historic interest are compared in both countries. However, the underlying framework, is a basically Canadian curriculum orientation, with emphasis on transition to Canadian culture and life.[41]

In conclusion, it is important to ask "could it be otherwise?" This discussion of curriculum fragmentation was not an attempt to denigrate the many programs for multicultural curriculum that exist,[42] but to subject the field to some sort of critical analysis. The answer to the question is a resounding "No" in the context of an analysis of cultural hegemony. Multicultural education takes the particular from that it does because it exists in the midst of a massive contradiction of national goals: those of diversity and those of equality. Multicultural education is an attempt to focus interest on the former, while the workings of dominant cultural forms relentlessly militate against the latter.

FOOTNOTES

1. Hugh R. Innis, *Bilingualism and Biculturalism: an abridged version of the Royal Commission Report.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1973, p. 133.
2. Commonwealth Education Portfolio, "Discussion Paper on Education in a Multicultural Australia" Canberra: mimeographed, 1979, p. 18.
3. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, *Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education.* Washington D.C.: NCATE, 1979, p. 4.
4. Abraham Stahl, "Adapting the Curriculum to the Needs of a Multiethnic Society: the Case of Israel," *Curriculum Inquiry* Vol. 9, (No. 4, Winter 1979) pp. 361-371.
5. Department of Education and Science, *The Education of Immigrants, Education Survey 13.* London:HMSO, 1971, quoted in David Kirp (ed.), *Doing Good by Doing Little: Race and Schooling in Britain.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979, p. 46-47.
6. Joel Novek, "Cultural Pluralism and the Challenge to the Modern Nation-State" in K.A. McLeod (ed.), *Multiculturalism, Bilingualism and Canadian Institutions.* Toronto: Guidance Centre, Faculty of Education, University of Toronto, 1979, p. 7.
7. Michael Banton, *The Idea of Race.* London: Tavistock, 1977.
8. Margaret Mead, "Our Educational Emphases in Primitive Perspective" in J. Middleton (ed.) *From Child to Adult.* New York: Natural History Press, 1970.
9. John Ogbu, *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective.* New York: Academic Press, 1978.
10. Committee on Multicultural Education, *Education for a Multicultural Society.* Canberra: Schools Commission, 1979, p. 5.
11. *Ibid,* p. 7.
12. See, for instance the extensive bibliography of John R. Mallea and Edward C. Shea (eds.), *Multiculturalism and Education.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979.
13. Madeleine MacDonald, *The Curriculum and Cultural Reproduction* II. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press, 1977, p. 69.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971, p. 40.
16. Albert N. Keim, *Compulsory Education and the Amish.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1975.
17. Work Group on Multicultural Programs, *Final Report.* Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, 1976.
18. *Ibid.*
19. "Maryland School Teaching French by 'Immersion'" *The New York Times,* October 12, 1980, p. 23.
20. A.B. Hodgetts and P. Gallagher, *Teaching Canada for the '80s.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978.

21. Philip Altbach, "The Distribution of Knowledge in the Third World: a Case Study in Neocolonialism" in P. Altoach and G. Kelly (eds.) *Education and Colonialism*. New York: Longman, 1978, pp. 301-330.

22. "Canadian Children's Dictionary Omits Much of U.S." *New York Times*, August 17, 1980, p. 58.

23. "Third World Vs. The Media" *New York Times Magazine*, September 21, 1980, p. 117.

24. Pierre Bourdieu, "Systems of Education and Systems of Thought." In Roger Dale (ed.) *Schooling and Capitalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, with the Open University Press, 1976.

25. [illegible]old Entwistle, *Class, Culture and Education*. London: Methuen, 1978.

26. [illegible]k Group on Multicultural Programs, *Final Report*. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, 1976, p. 25.

27. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, *Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education*. Washington D.C.: NCATE, 1979, p. 4.

28. Commonwealth Education Portfolio, "Education in a Multicultural Australia" p. 26.

29. John Ogbu, *Minority Education and Caste*, p. 174-175.

30. Raymond V. Padilla, *Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States*. Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University, Department of Foreign Languages and Bilingual Studies, 1979. *Multiculturalism*. Special issue "Language and Language Programs in Canada" December 1980, forthcoming.

31. Patricia Broadfoot, *Assessment, Schools, and Society*. London: Methuen, 1979, p. 100-102.

32. Commonwealth Education Portfolio, "Education in a Multicultural Australia" p. 29.

33. Vandra Masemann, "Multicultural Programs in Toronto Schools," *Interchange* vol. 9, (No. 1, 1978-79), pp. 29-44.

34. "ED Okays All-English *Lau* Program", *Education USA*, January 21, 1981, p. 159.

35. Carol R. Ember, "Cross-Cultural Cognitive Studies," *Annual Review of Anthropology* vol. 6 (1977), pp. 33-56. Courtney Cazden, Vera John and Dell Hymes, *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972. John Collier, *Alaskan Eskimo Education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973. All issues of *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*.

36. Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications, 1977.

37. Ontario Ministry of Education, *People of Native Ancestry, A Resource Guide for the Primary and Junior Divisions*. Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1975.

38. Center for Applied Linguistics, *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol I*. Arlington, Va: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

39. Vandra Masemann, "Ethnography of the Bilingual Classroom," *International Review of Education* vol. 24, (no. 3, 1979), pp. 295-307.

40. Personal observation, Milwaukee Wisconsin, May 1978; Toronto, Ontario 1979-1980.

41. Metropolitan Separate School Board. *Heritage Language Program, Italian Language and Culture Elective Program*. Toronto: MSSB, Continuing Education Dept., 1977.

42. Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, *Connex Directories*. Toronto, 49 Front St. East: CCCJ, 1980.

Language and Literature in a Multicultural Curriculum

Sister Anne Leonard

Le but de cet article est de montrer comment un cours sur la littérature canadienne et interculturelle élargit le concept de l'enseignement de l'Anglais, reflète notre héritage culturel et ouvre la porte à un éveil d'une conscience sociale dans l'éducation.

L'article traite de trois aspects de la langue et de la littérature dans un programme multiculturel. La première partie considère ce qu'est réellement et ce qu'implique notre société canadienne. La deuxième partie s'attache à l'enseignement de la littérature canadienne vue à travers trois thèmes majeurs touchant aux expériences des étudiants; la confrontation avec le pays-la notion que ce qui y est à l'état sauvage est un fait extérieur immédiat; la mobilité culturelle dans la mosaïque verticale; et le multiculturalisme-notre identité avec un certain futur. Nous incluons également un bref survol de la littérature anglaise dont le but est de permettre aux étudiants de voir l'évolution de la langue anglaise et sa grande tradition littéraire. Enfin, la troisième partie montrera comment la littérature interculturelle émerge, pareille à des cercles concentriques, d'une compréhension de la littérature canadienne et de l'héritage littétaire anglais. La littérature interculturelle inclut des oeuvres du monde entier, écrites ou traduites en Anglais. Loin d'être un projet définitif, cette étude se propose d'encourager d'autres personnes à explorer des moyens nouveaux et meilleurs permettant de développer une approche multiculturelle en ce qui concerne l'enseignement de la littérature aux Canadiens.

"Multiculturalism" and "multuculturalism in education" are now quite common terms. The reason for this interest in multiculturalism is probably two-fold: the reality that Canada is a country of many cultures and the federal policy statement of October 8, 1971. For some, multiculturalism is a philosophy viewed as "the development of one's ancestral roots or ethnicity for creative purposes in the hope that a distinctive Canadian identity will emerge."[1] For others, it is a call to preserve the dignity of the individual and his cultural group and guarantee "the rights of each group to retain its heritage and to maintain, develop and share its culture and language."[2] Whatever the definition encompasses, it must deal with a reality as well as an ideology. Government policy, both federal and provincial, points to a renovation of the image of Canada as a mosaic. Our national identity is rooted in our cultural history — or cultural memory. Roy Daniells once wrote that Canada, considered as an entity, is not a monolith; nor is it a melting pot; neither is it a mosaic. "If we seek," he said, "a more appropriate image, it is a web — a spider's web, a dynamic and purposeful structure, every strand of which exerts a pull on the other, a web which vibrates as a whole when touched at any point."[3] Multiculturalism is the alternative to both the vertical and ethnic mosaic, the middle ground between the melting pot and cultural pluralism — given the cultural pattern of Canada, which tends to perpetuate and accentuate minority and majority group status.

Multiculturalism is a unifying force furthering the end of education itself; its place in the curriculum should be to help students become wiser, more humane, more understanding and accepting, more truly democratic.[4] Moreover, multiculturalism is not an

additional body of knowledge to be taught in our schools as yet another subject. Rather, multiculturalism — that is, the understanding of peoples, of our society, and of our interaction at home and abroad — should permeate the approach to our teaching, both in terms of content and learning activities.

Canadian Literature

Just as literature comes from life-events, so too the development of a course in Canadian Literature should emerge from classroom experiences. Essentially the English teacher's task — among many things — is to teach literature and language to Canadians. Thus, what becomes important is the selection of material that will reflect the background of the students and give them a sense of being part of the world of literature.

In classes today, it is not uncommon to have about one quarter of the students whose first language is not English and who have certainly not been brought up on Winnie-the-Pooh, Beatrix Potter or Alice-in-Wonderland. Because of the multicultural background of the students, Canadian literature becomes a common meeting ground of experiences. Perhaps another advantage of Canadian Literature is that one does not have to begin at the beginning. In fact, it is a kind of immersion to concentrate on twentieth century writers because, in Canada, about eighty per cent of our writers are still alive. Approaches vary, but the following thematic approach allows for both a regional focus and an historical perspective.

Three dominant patterns emerge in Canadian Literature: (1) the confrontation with the land — the fact that the wilderness is just outside, (2) cultural mobility (or immobility) within the vertical mosaic, (3) and multiculturalism defined as a sense of identity with a future. These and many more themes now flood the Canadiana selections, on bookshelves but from this plethora of material one can choose and tailor topics appropriate to one or another of these three categories. Theme number three — multiculturalism — is somewhat all inclusive. At the very beginning of the courses, students can be encouraged to share their family tree and include ancestral anecdotes from their beckoning past.[5] Thus, they also become aware of a reality which recognizes not only diversity of backgrounds but also common aspirations and a common "new home".

The poetry, of both our early writers, and those writing today, deals in large part with interpreting our land to ourselves. The land has come to symbolize our inner lives, the unconscious and irrational in us. The image of the mirror is common; the land, like a mirror, often reflects our true selves and interprets the ultimate meaning of the cycle of life. Margaret Atwood's "Further Arrivals" illustrates that nature is at once threatening and demanding; our environment provides a confrontation with the self and creates a need for reconciliation:

FURTHER ARRIVALS

After we had crossed the long illness
that was the ocean, we sailed up-river

On the first island
the immigrants threw off their clothes
and danced like sandflies.

We left behind one by one
the cities rotting with cholera
one by one our civilized
distinctions
and entered a large darkness

It was our own
ignorance we entered

I have not come out yet

My brain gropes nervous
tentacles in the night, sends out
fears, hairy as bears,
demands lamps, or waiting

for my shadowy husband, hears
malice in the trees' whispers

I need wolf's eyes to see
the truth

I refuse to look in a mirror

Whether the wilderness is
real or not
depends on who lives there.[8]

Entering our land, coming face to face with the wilderness, is to encounter our own vulnerability — our limitations, and feelings of helplessness, and sometimes of homelessness:

The young breeze trips across the grass
The river flows without return
Our hearts in pangs of love, alas
Feel far off throes that wound and burn.[7]

These lines of Pavel Javor from *Songs of Ithaca*, translated from Czech by Watson Kirkconnell, represent the frightening experience of leaving one's homeland to take up a new life, as frightening for the newcomer today as it was for the early pioneer. A student from Calcutta said that she felt threatened by the space, the few people on our streets, the silence. The myths, tales and poetry of our native people complement the immigrant's fear of the landscape: their symbiotic attraction to the rhythm and patterns of nature teaches industrialized twentieth century youth to respect, revere, and learn from nature, and not to try to dominate and destroy it.

Northrop Frye suggests that the significant trait in Canadian culture is "the feeling for the immense searching distance, with the lines of communication extended to the absolute limit, which is the primary geographical fact about Canada which has no counterpart elsewhere."[8] We find this reality of strained distance in the works of the Group of Seven and in Emily Carr, "whose real vision seems to be in the depth of the forest *behind* the picture."[9] We find it in the poets who hint at the awesome — the riddle of inexplicable death — hidden beyond and behind the present scene. It is there in Lampman's "crying in the dark"; in T. G. Roberts' "Blue Heron," and in his "Still as death"; in Ralph Gustafson's "Valley of Wenkchema" with its sense of endless height and depth; and in Earle Birney's hermit in "Bushed" who bars himself into the very solitude that has driven him mad with fear. Even the closely focused vision of a street scene by Margaret Avison or Raymond Souster evokes the frightening loneliness of a huge and thinly settled country. In Canadian Literature one finds universal experiences which have become an important part of modern literature — images of the exile, the outsider, the alienated man, always seeking to wall himself in.

Related to this theme of confrontation with the land is what has come to be called our colonial or garrison mentality. Halifax's Citadel still dominates the city and recalls that element of self-preservation that characterized our cultural growth and political affiliations. D. G. Jones says that "the only real defence is to abandon defence, to surrender the garrison and embrace the life of the land."[10] What this surrender entails is really letting go of "proper appearances"[11] and speaking from the heart. Hagar Shipley comments in Margaret Laurence's *Stone Angel* at the end of her life:

. . . . When did I ever speak the truth?
Pride was my wilderness and the demon that led me there was fear.
I was alone, never anything else, and never free, for I carried my
chains with me, and they spread out from me and shackled all I touched.[12]

Noah Adler in Mordecai Richler's *Son of a Smaller Hero* also rejects "proper appearances" — his grandfather, family and community. But he must leave not only the Jewish community, but also Canada, and go back to Europe. Northrop Frye speaks of "the real terror (that) comes when the individual feels himself becoming an individual, pulling away from the group, losing the sense of driving power that the group gives him, aware of a conflict within himself far subtler than the struggle of morality against evil."[13] In Richler's later novel, *The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz*, Duddy's infatuation with a piece of land in the Laurentians is an egotistical fulfilment of a need to prove himself in the eyes of his family. The land is his self-set goal to success. The ghetto is another form of the garrison — "a closely knit and beleaguered society, and its moral and social values are unquestionable. In a perilous enterprise one does not discuss causes or motives: one is either a fighter or a deserter.[14]

Contemporary writers are concerned about man's subjugation of the land. Mind over matter has characterized the settlers' attitude so that today there are vast areas of devastated land, polluted lakes and dried up rivers. In the voices of native peoples and our poets we hear again the land speaking to us its "most secret desire/to be a thing alive made manifest."[15] A poem, entitled "Differences", an adaptation from Harold Cardinal's *Unjust Society*, reflects the Indians' response to the land and their need for one another:

DIFFERENCES

Indians look at nature
and see beauty —
the woods,
the marshes,
the mountains
the grasses and berries,
the moose and the field mouse,
the soaring eagle
and the flitting hummingbird,
the gaudy flowers
and the succulent bulbs.
They see a fitness,
an overall beauty,
but they look deeper.
They see diversity.

They admire the grace of a leaping deer
the straight-line simplicity
of the pines the deer leaps through,
the jagged, three-dimensional
thrust into the sky
of the rugged peaks,
the quick silver flash
of a trout
on the surface of a wind-rippled lake.
They turn a sensitive ear
to the faraway eerie wail
of the loon
and the nearer snuffling grunt
of a bear
pawing at a ground squirrel's den,
and they blend them
into the whispering grasses
and the bolder talk of the tall pines.
They feel the touch of wind
against their cheeks
and the coolness
of the mist above the rapids.
They survey the diversity of nature
and find it good.

Indians think this might be
the way of people.
They know that whites and Indians
are different
They know that there are differences
even within these larger groups
differences between
Scott and Ukrainian,
between Cree and Iroquois.

To Indians
this is the natural way of things.
As the stream needs the woods,
as the flowers need the breeze,
as the deer needs the grasses,
so do people have need of each other,
and so can people find good
in each other.[16]

This poem acts as a bridge between an emphasis on the land and the theme of cultural mobility within the vertical mosaic. George Woodcock in his book *Canada and the Canadians* makes the following provocative comment about the people:

> The fact is that, though the land, including the forest and the minerals/beneath it, is still the necessary heart of Canadian life, the people who live on the land have ceased to be a power in the country.[17]

This comment needs reflection: perhaps we are too busy exploiting and subjugating the land to let ouselves become a part of it; perhaps those who really live on the land are the small people unable to exert any power; perhaps we simply need to know and love the land, the place where our feet are to become the meek who possess the land. Novels and short prose frequently deal with the subject of the interaction of the different life-styles as the second generation adapts to a new way of life and ceases to value the customs of its ancestors.

In his book, *The Vertical Mosaic,* John Porter describes the hierarchical relationship between Canada's many cultural groups in class and power. The Canadians of British origin have retained charter group status with the French considered as co-charter group in some institutional settings. While a degree of behavioural assimilation among some groups has taken place, institutional assimilation has not always done so. The majority of second generation Canadians speak English and no longer retain their parents' native tongue. They have adopted the prevailing culture and value system, but find they do not make it into the agencies and institutions that operate society. Positions of power, influence, and prestige have tended to go to Canadians of British descent.[18]

Literature presents this incongruity. Margaret Atwood in her work, *Survival,* speaks of the "Reluctant Immigrant" who finds that having sacrificed his homeland he is being forced to sacrifice what he came to Canada to preserve — his religion, his culture, his beliefs.[19] Our writers show us a generation gap widened by the wedge of adaptation to a new culture. Sons and daughters who have mastered the English language begin to reject the values of their parents and frequently marry outside their cultural community. These failed sacrifices occur in the second generation seeking acculturation — Isaac in Adele Wiseman's *The Sacrifice,* Noah in Richler's *Son of Smaller Hero,* and Fredelle Breuner Maynard in her autobiography, *Raisins and Almonds.* These personages reject their family's values and Jewish tradition yet never feel at ease in either the old or new dispensation. The Hungarian Sandor Hunyadi in Marilyn's *Under the Ribs of Death* actually changes his name to Alex Hunter because of his ambition to succeed in the English-speaking world. These novels reflect the need for the story to be told not only about the immigrants and the pioneers but about their children — those sons and daughters of smaller heroes — who have to find their identity, their purpose, their community, as Myrna Kostash says, "somewhere between Galicia and downtown Canada."[20] There

is a hint in these writings that only in the third generation will there be a feeling of belonging; that is, when a generation can accept its cultural heritage and the larger spiritual values of its ancestors which the consumer society is so ready to destroy.

Today there is a need — "a Canadian need" — as Northrop Frye says, "to possess and internalize our home" because through exploration, rail, roads, and air "we have filled in the distances."[21] Maybe up until 1975 we were not sure "Where is here?" — the question that both Frye and Atwood ask — and that we still felt that the head-office was somewhere else. That mentality seems to be changing. Canada has become "my country" not just legally on receiving citizenship papers in a formal setting but in a more profound sense; when someone is able to say "I am a Canadian" or "I come from Canada" he becomes truly a Canadian because he ceases to look back and begins to look ahead. It is precisely this attitude of belonging that is giving direction to present Canadian writing. Moreover, this sense of "having arrived" has created an important mentality that is now capable of looking to the future. There is no other place we have come from; the journey has ended; Canada is here and now.

Immigrants who learn English as their adoptive language are having an effect on the concept of the Canadian mosaic so that, to quote George Woodcock, "the edges of the mosaic are culturally, at least, beginning to blur and soften" except in the case of Quebec "where for the most part little cracks are widening into dark fissures."[22]

Language has a very important dimension in the context of literature in a multicultural and cross-cultural curriculum. Because of the strong bond between the preservation of a culture and the retention of language there has been much energy expended in the teaching of the first language in special language schools. To support the preservation of one's first language and the learning of a second or third language are values that should be inherent in any policy of multiculturalism; but over the years of Canadian social development there has been an attitude that a people's culture is expected to decline in influence to the vanishing point over three generations and as the language goes so also goes the culture. Nova Scotia, on the contrary, has shown that language is not the only cultural preservative; there is the Canadian historical identity of a group. Despite the passage of years, despite the loss of ethnic language, despite the absense of community institutions, a cultural presence remains. This presence is essentially the recognition of the historical identity of the group here in Canada. Moreover, Nova Scotians consider their province to be an ethnically diverse one. A recent publication *People of Nova Scotia* prepared for the Multicultural Association of Nova Scotia deals with thirty ethnic groups and hopes that a second edition will include the rest — a total of more than sixty groups. Book II is a collection of personal stories, poems and viewpoints. The Estonian-born Dartmouth resident's comments are worth noting:

> What impressed me on my arrival (1966) and what I still appreciate is the support given to multiculturalism. The financial support by various levels of government, the emotional support and interest by individuals and the complete ease with which one can be "different" is something Canada and Nova Scotia can be proud of.[23]

Not everyone who has come to Canada has as enthusiastic a response. Like the German-born ministers, some give advice to "Have Patience!"[24] Others have spoken of prejudice and scars. The significant point is that ethnic cultures — defined through geographical, national and ethnic affiliation — are for the most part communities without institutions nor do they retain their language. What is important is their Canadian his-

tory and their sense of being Canadian. Each collectivity has made its own history and tradition. Except for the Micmacs and Acadians ethnic languages have almost disappeared. Ethnic diversity is, therefore, not a question of language alone; yet something of the peculiar language structures has remained. The assimilation of one attribute — the language — has not resulted in the obliteration of the other — the culture.

The Indians and Inuit are also very much part of the pattern of cultural preservation and cultural mobility within the vertical mosaic. They have had to succumb to western values superimposed upon their own vulnerable culture. The effect of the paternalistic policy of the North West Mounted Police and the Treaties negotiated to ensure physical survival but cultural death is quietly portrayed in George Ryga's one-act play, *Indian*.[25] The clash comes when the Agent asks the Indian his name. The Indian replies: "Maybe I got no name at all . . . It makes you scared you should know too much about me." Wilfred Pelletier's personal essay, "For Every North American Indian Who Begins to Disappear I Also Begin to Disappear," exhibits the contrast between the culture of the Indian whose closeness to the land borders on the sacramental and the white man's detached and impersonal attitude, his preoccupation with time and with getting things done. Nan Shipley's novel, *Return to the River*, Fred Bodsworth's *The Strange One* and Hubert Evans' *Mist on the River* portray this clash of cultures. In "The Executioners' Farley Mowat shows the incongruity of imposing English legal standards on an unsuspecting people already exploited by the government. The Inuit way of life has been too austere to expect a great literary tradition. Their poems reveal their dependence upon nature; in their sculpture and art they have caught the tensions of the living animal and the affinity between man and his quarry. Failure to grasp their way of life is subtly expressed in Alden Nowlan's poem "The Gift". A son has sent a soapstone carving done by the Inuit of Resolute to his mother:

> *She won't say*
> *What she thinks of this gift, except such things*
> *as one must say of gifts from sons. It's plain*
> *this hard and intimately squalid thing*
> *shocks her. I see its gradual ascension*
> *into the attic to be kept, forgotten.*[26]

Through literature students can look at the values, attitudes and beliefs of people and see what there is in common, what would help toward unity and better understanding. They should be made aware of the strong role played by religion as a cultural force.

In the short story, writers of the sixties represented a shift of focus from setting to character. The personal essays and short stories frequently reveal types of folk-heroes of the different regions of Canada: Bibul in Jack Ludwig's "Requiem for Bibul," Père Ledoux in Lemelin's "Situation of the Cross," and Solomon in Norman Duncan's "Fruits of Toil," to name a few. "With Guitar and Dreams" by Kenneth Bagnell is the story of a young lad from a poor family in Prince Edward Island who tries to make his way in Toronto. He finds his lack of education prevents him from getting a job. The essay moves beyond the local scene to the broader issue of the state's responsibility for the individual to fit himself for the world about him and come out of his dream world. In "Escape to the City" by George Woodward, there is also the focus of the larger issue of isolation in the big city. Hugh Hood's "Predictions of Ice" set in Montreal's shipyards shows the interaction of levels of business which go beyond the city out into the competitive world where Big Business interests control the affairs of the little man.

Awareness of different cultures and different social levels can be fostered in our students through the literature of our country. By beginning with the classroom as the microcosm of our country, teachers can help their students to learn about and from one another and to feel secure in the history, literature and heritage of their own family and community.

Cross-cultural Literature

World Literature is "the one great heart which beats for the concerns and misfortunes of the world, even though these are represented and visible in different separate ways in each of its corners."[27] These words of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn written on the occasion of his Nobel Lecture, 1970, reflect the need to concern ourselves with another culture and to use literature as a means of coming into contact with it.

But the question is how — where to begin? When the caterpillar asked Alice, "And who are you?", she was hard put to answer. The question implies a relationship and so when we talk about our Canadian identity we can really only know ourselves in terms of relationship. And so too with language and literature. Thus it is important for our senior students to know something of the growth and heritage of the English language and literature through a few selected works representative of major periods: the Anglo-Saxon and a study of *Beowulf;* the Medieval with a study of Chaucer's "Prologue" to *The Canterbury Tales* and one tale; the Elizabethan period including Shakespeare and his play, *Hamlet;* and finally the seventeenth to the twentieth century with poetry selections to include neo-classicists, romantics and Victorians. Covering such a span of literature might seem rather ambitious but there are advantages. The evolution of the language can prove as interesting to the students as grappling with the literary genres. Good recordings of Old and Middle English bring to life the richness of the oral tradition.

It is not difficult after that unit on English Literature to move into other literary works. Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* works well once students have overcome the difficulty of the nineteenth century language and have realized the setting is the seventeenth century. This classic of American literature introduces them to a cultural memory that has become part of the literary heritage of the United States. Discussion of American novels read in other years — *The Great Gatsby*, for example — deepens and broadens an understanding of the relationship of culture and literature. *Cry, the Beloved Country* has been on the Grade Twelve programme for some years. It is a challenge to some but with the help of a guest speaker who has lived in South Africa, the book will begin to come alive. Many students are captivated by the sheer poetry of the language and some have found passages that can be shaped into poems. Then there are translations, works such as *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch* and *The Tin Flute,* which take us into the mind of another culture. Sheila Fischman, well-known as an interpreter of French works into English, said that she enjoyed "interpreting one culture to another."[28] Lawyer-poet and translator F. R. Scott believed strongly in translation as a poetic art, and claimed that for Canada it is "an essential ingredient in Canada's entity."[29] What he says of poetry is applicable to other forms of literature: "There is no better way of finding out how words can be put together to make a poem than by translating poems and no better window opening upon a country than that which poets provide."[30] In his introduction to *The Poems of French Canada,* Scott focuses his concern on the English-French cultures when he writes:

How to build a Canada that would allow two principal cultures to flourish freely became an intellectual and emotional challenge, and, in the endeavour, literature would obviously play an important role.[11]

This statement could be modified to read: "How to build a Canada that would allow all cultures to flourish freely is an intellectual and emotional challenge wherein translation of literature can obviously play an important role." The translator is one who must believe in the creative effect of two cultures coming together. His influence can be far-reaching for the building of a better understanding of peoples.

The following short poem written by a Croatian and translated by a Canadian teacher helps to show how literature with its universal themes can become a cross-cultural bridge:

ONE MAN IN PARIS

Speak! Don't grieve
You have nothing to repent;
Night comes to earth in this far land
Just as in my homeland,
And there are tears here just as there,
Under rags and under riches
and in peoples' eyes . . .
Beneath the golden stars.[12]

by Dragutin Tadijanović. Trans. Joanne Whitney

Literature produced as a result of this cross-cultural contact frequently reflects the writer-in-exile since the writer draws on a culture he has abandoned while he has not quite adjusted to the new culture. East Indian and African writers have a deep concern over literature written in English posing a threat to their country's cultural identity. They feel their writing is a hybrid and they long to write about their own life "to strike a line for yourself/from the iron of life's ordinariness" as the poet R. Parthansarthay wrote.[13]

For us, in Canada, this hybrid situation should not become aberrant but rather the healthy reflection of our multicultural country. When we consider the literary works that the parents and grandparents of many of our students were brought up on "we are probably beginning to realize that if they came from Kiev, Dubrovnik, or Pilsen they weren't reading Dickens, Thackeray and Austen. Their reading far more likely consisted of Jirasek, Mazurovich and Shevchenko," to quote author Jan Drabek, who sees that the next step is to place these writers on our reading lists. They should not be alternative reading lists — "as some exotic blossoms whose relevance to our lives seems marginal — but right alongside of Dickens, Thackeray and Austen just as the Kowalskis, Steinbergs and Shepilovs across Canada live and feel quite comfortable alongside the MacDonalds, Trupshaws and Smiths."[14]

Important too in this consideration of cross-cultural literature is that body of literature by writers who have lived abroad and whose writing has been affected by another environment: Dorothy Livesay and Margaret Laurence, for example, with their African experiences. There are those writers who have lived in Canada for a while but have returned to their own or gone to another country; Brian Moore, Malcolm Lowry and Harold Ladoo are writers who have left their mark on Canadian literature. These writers have shown depth of perception added to talent.

If, in the teaching of literature we begin by using Canada and her culture as a centre, we can move into ever widening circles that cross like the Great Circles of our sphere. The important thing is to begin with the students and to design a course that will encompass their own cross-cultural world and so make contact with world literature and multiculturalism. A good criterion for making a start is to choose world literature relative to Canadian multiculturalism, that is, to choose writing generated by the meeting of cultures, works in which the central experience is cross-cultural. George Jonas' book of poetry, *Cities*, contains this central experience; in the words of Jan Drabek, it has "powerful verbal pictures of places like Vienna, Bucharest and Toronto that flow together to provide a worldly experience that will stay with you for months."[34]

Through Canadian and Cross-cultural literature we can help build a sense of worth in being Canadian and can blend traditions of the past with present and future aspirations. We can help link Canada to the world, offsetting divisions among peoples and changing attitudes. At the same time, let us hope that we can give our students something that will stay with them not just for months but for life.

FOOTNOTES

1. *Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism*, Ottawa: Secretary of State, 1973, quoted by the Honourable Mark MacGuigan, "Address at Gaithesburg, Marlyland," Feb. 19, 1975, p. 24.
2. *Conference Proceedings: Toward a Provincial Multicultural Policy*, Victoria: Provincial Government of British Columbia, April 3, 4, 1979, p. 14.
3. Roy Daniells, "The Cultural History of Canada-Centennial Project, 1972" *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Series IV, Vol. X, 1972, pp. 7, 8.
4. Cf. Dr. T. Johnstone, "An Overview of Ethnic Services in the Department of Education," *Journal of Education*, Spring '77, pp. 15-17; Fall '77, pp. 14, 15.
5. Cf. James McGivern, "The Beckoning Past," *The Review*, Number 4, 1979, Issue 348, Toronto: Imperial Oil Ltd., pp. 22-27.
6. Margaret Atwood, *The Journals of Susanna Moodie*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1970.
7. Paul Javor, *Smoke from Ithaca*, trans. Watson Kirkconnell, *Letters in Canada*, 1960, pp. 508, 509.
8. Northrop Frye, *The Bush Garden*. Toronto: Anansi, 1971, p. 10.
9. *Ibid.*
10. D.G. Jones, *Butterfly on Rock*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 36.
11. Northrop Frye, *The Bush Garden*, p. 226.
12. Margaret Laurence, *The Stone Angel*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968, p. 292.
13. Northrop Frye, *The Bush Garden*, p. 226.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Irving Layton, "Butterfly on Rock," *Poems*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965.
16. Harold Cardinal, *The Unjust Society*, adapted by Allison et al. ed., *People Mirrors*, Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1974, pp. 70-71.
17. George Woodcock, *Canada and the Canadians*. London: Faber and Faber, 1970, pp. 191-192.
18. Cf. John Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968, p. xiii.
19. Cf. Margaret Atwood, *Survival*. Toronto: Anansi, 1972, pp. 145-159.
20. Myrna Kostash, *All of Baba's Children*. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1977, p. 8.
21. Northrop Frye, *Journey Without Arrival*. National Film Board, 106C 0176 140 (56' 58"). This film was first televised in 1975 as *Images of Canada*.
22. George Woodcock, *Canada and the Canadians*, p. 94.
23. People of Nova Scotia, Book II. Halifax: Multicultural Association of Nova Scotia, 1980, p. 62.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 80.
25. George Ryga, *Indian*. Agincourt: The Book of Canada, 1962, p. 7. The essays and short stories discussed in this article are part of the series, *Searchlights* of The Book Society of Canada.
26. Alden Nowlan, "The Gift," *Under the Ice*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1969.
27. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *The Nobel Lectures on Literature*, trans. Thomas P. Whitney. New York: Harper and Row, 1972, p. 32.
28. Sheila Fischman, An Interview: *Quill and Quire*, Feb., 1979, p. 35.
29. F.R. Scott, "Introduction," *The Poems of French Canada*. Burnaby: Blackfish Press, 1977, p. vi.
30. *Ibid.*, p. i.
31. *Ibid.*, p. iv.
32. Dragutin Tadijanović, "One Man in Paris," trans. Joanne Whitney. Vancouver; Private Collection.
33. R. Parthansarthay. Quoted by G. Amirthanayagam at the Conference on World Literature, Vancouver, November, 1978. cf. *Rough Passage* by R. Parthansarthay, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1976; "Parthansarthay dwells upon the question of language and identity and upon the inner conflict that arises from being brought up in two cultures." (*Ten Twentieth Century Poets*, ed. R. Parthansarthay, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1976, p. 74). In the introduction he says Indian verse in English "is Indian in sensibility and content, and English in language. It is rooted in and stems from the Indian environment and reflects its mores often ironically" p. 3.
34. Jan Drabek, "World Literature," talk given at Conference on World Literature, Vancouver, November, 1978.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*

Multiculturalism In The Soviet Union: Problems And Implications Of Language And Educational Policy

Nigel Grant
University of Glasgow

Les différents peuples qui composent l'URSS varient beaucoup en nombre d'habitants et en niveau de développement. Ils parlent des langues diverses. Il y a des problèmes évidents en matière de développement de langue. D'autres, moins évidents concernent les rapports entre la langue parlée et les autres facteurs culturels tels que la religion. Les tendances actuelles comprennent des réponses variées à l'assimilation, aux changements démographiques, en particulier l'augmentation relative de la population chez les peuples du centre de l'Asie.

Légalement, chaque individu a le droit d'être éduqué dans la langue de son choix et dans les écoles où la langue maternelle est enseignée, on apprend aussi le Russe en tant que langue de l'URSS. Mais on se heurte à un problème de nombre. On peut obtenir une éducation complète dans les langues des Républiques de l'Union; mais des groupes moins importants du point de vue du nombre de ceux qui parlent une certaine langue n'ont accès que partiellement à une éducation dans cette langue. Les groupes qui ne disposent pas encore d'une langue écrite doivent utiliser sans exception le Russe ou une autre langue. Cet exemple de pluralisme se limite largement à la langue; le contenu de l'éducation est plus uniforme.

Le niveau dans l'éducation des groupes variés montre beaucoup d'inégalités: les Juifs, les Géorgiens et les Arméniens viennent en première position, suivis de loin par la plupart des peuples de l'Asie du centre. Certaines de ces inégalités peuvent s'expliquer par le degré d'urbanisation ou le poucentage de population parlant couramment le Russe. Mais ces rapports ne sont pas bien établis et il y a beaucoup d'exceptions. La vitalité de la culture indigène joue aussi un rôle, mais dans beaucoup de cas, nous n'avons pas d'explication complète.

Des développements depuis 1970 montrent un nivellement des différences en général, un progrès considérable chez les peuples de l'Asie du centre et une diminution des individus appartenant aux groupes les plus favorisés et ayant accès à une éducation supérieure. Ceci étaye la théorie selon laquelle il existe un taux d'admission et suggère une politique soutenue visant à l'amélioration en Asie centrale; ces deux mesures faisant partie d'une politique générale d'égalisation.

Ce qu'impliquent ces tendances actuelles est encore peu clair. Essayer d'encourager la "convergence" pourrait être dangereux; mais le développement du pluralisme, bien que difficile, offre plus d'espoir pour le futur d'un état multinational. L'Ouest aussi a à affronter les problèmes du multiculturalisme et peut tirer profit de l'étude des échecs et succès de l'expérience soviétique.

Background

The USSR is, by definition, as well as in fact, a multinational state. The use of the terms "Russian" and "Soviet" as if they were synonymous is just as erroneous as the equation of "England" and "Britain". There are over a hundred nationalities in the Soviet Union, ranging in size from the Russians who make up about half the total population, down to groups numbered in thousands or even hundreds, like the Selkup, Tofalar and Yukagir.[1] Some of the nationalities are small and scattered, raising practical problems in education.

It could be argued that, emotional problems apart, there are few fundamental *learning* difficulties when closely related languages are involved, like Russian, Ukrainian and

Byelorussian. Whether the aim is to *transfer* from one usage to another (as from Catalan to Castilian in Franco Spain, or from Occitan to French even now), or to develop competence in another usage *as well* (as in Norway or post-Franco Catalonia), the linguistic similarities can be used to help the process. But this is not the situation with most of the Soviet nationalities. Many, to be sure, belong to the same Indo-European family as the Slavs — the Baltic Lithuanians and Latvians, the Romance Moldavians,[2] the Germanic Yiddish-speaking Jews,[3] the Iranian Tadzkiks and Ossetians, and the Armenians, whose language forms a separate branch of the family; but so do speakers of English, Italian, Hindi and Gaelic. Beyond a certain point, affinity is of little help in learning.

Linguistic differences rarely exist by themselves. They may be the most conspicuous characteristics, but are frequently one of a whole set of cultural factors, many of which carry practical and political implications for education. One of these concerns the suitability of the languages themselves for formal educational use.

That is not to say that some languages are inherently too "primitive" — lacking perhaps a written form, or complexity and subtlety of grammatical structure, or the vocabulary to handle the concepts of a technological society and a formal school system. Macauley's dismissal of the Indian vernaculars as suitable media for modern education, or the reluctance of British or French (or Russian) colonial administrators to see the languages of the peoples they ruled as anything but primitive jargons, might have been thought to have died out in the 19th Century; and advances in the study of linguistics would, surely, have demolished finally the idea that the indigenous tongues of Africa, Asia or the Americas lacked complexity. (Colonial administrators, of course, tended not only to be ethnocentric in their attitudes, but also to come across vernaculars in a basic "pidginised" version). But since such judgements are *still* being made about the viability of, say, Gaelic in Scotland, Kiswahili or Hausa in Africa or Hindi in India, this question should perhaps be disposed of also.[4]

Historically, such devaluing of languages new to the educational mainstream is commonplace. English, German and Russian have all in their day been held inferior to French or Latin; and the latter, in its turn, was thought by its speakers of the early Empire to compare ill with the virtues of Greek. It is the social perception of the status of the *speakers* of a language, not its inherent qualities, that raises doubts about its capacity as a means of communication and learning. Nor is the lack of a written form all that serious; where that is lacking, it can be supplied — as the Academy of Sciences of the USSR has done in many cases.[5] (Again, this is precisely what happened in the case of Western and Eastern Europeans alike: they adapted the Latin or Cyrillic forms of the Greek alphabet to suit their own circumstances).

Vocabulary is another matter. Any language, being a social activity, is likely to be adapted to the social and natural environment in which it is used. (Consider, for example, the variety of words for "camel" in Arabic or "snow" in Inuit; these reflect differences which matter). At the time of the Revolution, many of the languages of the Soviet Far North were admirably adapted to the exigencies of shamanistic religion and a nomadic pastoral economy, but lacked the equipment to deal with the realities of a 20th Century industrial state. This is not an inherent lack; languages can and do form new lexical items as new needs arise, either by building on native root material (the favoured method in Chinese, Arabic, German and to some extent in the Slavonic languages), or by borrowing and adapting from some convenient source. Thus, Soviet Turkic and Northern languages have drawn heavily on Russian, much as Swahili drew on Arabic, English

on French and Romanian on Slavonic and Hungarian. There are *some* problems. If the cultural levels of the two language groups are far apart until the borrowed material is fully assimilated, entry to the formal educational system can expose the learner to alienation and culture shock.

But if this is a short-term problem, other cultural variables can prove more intractable. It is recognised in the USSR that there are still serious inequalities in aspiration and achievement between urban and rural pupils. It has been widely noted that the problems of minority groups are in large measure those of peripheral areas. However, strictly speaking, the "rural problem" in the USSR is quite distinct from the problems of nationalities; but when these coincide — as they often do — difficulties can be compounded.

Another cultural variable causing problems is religion. Zvi Halevy and Eva Etsioni-Halevy[8] have examined the different levels of educational attainment among the Soviet nationalities, classified by religious background rather than language, in an attempt to test the "Hans hypothesis" that the formal educational attainment of a group is correlated with actual or traditional religious affiliation, in descending order from Jewish to Protestant to Catholic to Orthodox to Muslim. On the whole, their findings confirm the hypothesis up to fairly recent times, when the Central Asian peoples began to close the gap of economic and social development. It is possible to argue that the differentials reflected levels of social advance as much as attitudes in the first place, and that these have become less important as religious belief dwindles among the various Soviet peoples. But the correlation up to recent times is intriguing, considering that the actual observances of the religion had fallen out of favour, and in many cases out of use. Religious affiliation, like language, may often serve as the main identity symbol in a whole cluster of folkways, values and attitudes, which may or may not be connected with the theology itself. Warring Protestants and Catholics in Northern-Ireland, for instance, seem to have little interest in converting anyone, for their disputes have little to do with belief but a great deal to do with identity and power, religion being a convenient label. Similarly, many American Catholics, Jews and agnostics cheerfully subscribe in their social and professional behaviour to what is still known as the "Protestant ethic", though its connections with religious values of any kind are now obscure. In Muslim societies, the "traditional" attitudes towards the role of women are particularly marked, though not all go as far as forbidding them to work with men or drive cars. One still hears of many cases from Soviet Central Asia of girls being kept away from school, forced into arranged marriages, and of such illegal practices as the exaction of bride-price. (Significantly, the price seems to go *down* the higher the girl's qualifications are).[9] It can happen, that when the central authorities are dealing with a linguistic minority, there may be far more to it than language; cultural differences impinge on the aims and content of education and may pose a greater challenge than the question of the language of instruction.

Current Trends

Before going on to look at education, we have to take account of current linguistic, cultural and demographic trends which affect the background factors. Quite apart from official policy and government action, the push-and-pull effect between cultural assimilation and self-assertion seems to have a dynamic of its own, and it works differently in different cases. For example, the legal policy towards Ukrainian and Armenian is identical, and in both Republics the indigenous language is in conspicuous official use; yet one

rarely hears Ukrainian spoken in the streets of Kiev or Russian in the streets of Erevan. About eighty per cent of the schools in the Ukraine use Ukrainian as the medium of instruction, and teach Russian as a second language; but in Kiev itself the position is reversed, and most of the inhabitants speak Russian with a Ukrainian accent. In Armenia, by contrast, only some three per cent of the schools use Russian as the medium of instruction, though children learn it is a second language. The normal language of communication is, overwhelmingly, Armenian.[8]

The reasons for such disparities are a matter for speculation. It has been suggested (and forcefully) that the Ukraine has long been subjected to pressures of Russification in order to contain potentially disruptive nationalist aspirations, in contrast to Armenia which is too small and remote to pose any threat to the dominant Russians. This is quite possible, though hard to prove; but there must be other mechanisms at work. It is quite credible that Ukrainian, being closer to Russian, is more open to cultural penetration, rather as Scots was by English or Norwegian (for a long time) by Danish. The contrast between the Ukrainian-speaking countryside and Russian-speaking Kiev is suggestive, and is paralleled in miniature by a similar contrast between English-speaking Edinburgh and the nearby areas of Lothian and other parts of Lowland Scotland where Scots survives (albeit in dialect form), though in this case without any official sanction at all. Armenian is quite distinct; it has its own script, its own high culture dating from the fifth century, and it serves a small but compact population. There is a growing body of international evidence that the conventional picture of steady assimilation of smaller to larger groups, though partly valid, is much too simplistic, and that pressures to assimilate may produce, by reaction, the assertion of identity by minority groups.[9] It would be astonishing if the USSR were exempt from either of these trends, official positions notwithstanding.

The balance of population is changing also. Fertility rates differ considerably among the peoples of the USSR.[10] The non-Russian peoples, notably those of Central Asia, are increasing at a much faster rate than the Russians; it will not be long before the Soviet Union is indisputably a country of minorities, the Russians included. Ideally, of course, this is not supposed to matter, as all are "brother-peoples" together. But in practice no group likes to see its relative position weakened, and, consequently, developments in nationality policy are bound to reflect *Realpolitik*, and in turn are bound to affect educational policy and practice.

Constitutional and Legal Position

As far as the medium of instruction is concerned, there is no great problem about the legal position of minorities: all citizens have the right to use their mother tongue if they so wish, and this includes the education of their children. Actually, it is a little more complex than that (quite apart from practical difficulties, which will be considered presently); strictly speaking, every citizen of the USSR has the right to use any of the languages of the country he or she chooses, not necessarily the mother tongue. It may be Russian, and often is for a host of practical reasons, or it may be another vernacular. Most of the small ethnic groups of the Far North who lack a written language use Russian, but the Barabas show a preference for Tatar, the Dolgans for Yakut, and the Kereks for Chukchi. In the Caucasus, only the Aisor are listed as making exclusive use of Russian for this purpose; Avar is preferred by the Andi, Archi, Akhvakh, Bezhita,

Botlikhe, Ginukhe, Gunzib, Godoberi, Dido, Karati, Dagestani Tat, Tindi, Khvarshi and Chamali peoples, Azerbaidzhani by the Budukhes, Kryz, Rutul, Talysh, Tats, Khinalugs and Tsakhurs; similarly, the Aguls use Lesgin and the Bats, Svans and Udis use Georgian. In Central Asia, most of the small groups use Tadzhik, while the Baluchis use Turkmen and the Dungans Kazakh. In some of these cases, Russian is listed as the *second* literary language, but for many it does not appear at all. Language of choice, then, usually means the mother tongue, but there are cases where this is not so. (See Table 3).[11]

If Soviet policy is pluralist, it is on the British or Spanish model rather than the Swiss, Belgian or Yugoslav; that is, Russian, as the majority language and the language of the Soviet state, is taught in all non-Russian schools, and may be used as the main medium of instruction if parents so wish. According to the 1970 Census, only among urban Tatars, Byelorussians, Moldavians, Lithuanians, Latvians and Kazakhs did more than 50 per cent claim fluency in Russian, and even among these groups the figure for the rural population was much lower. If the aim is to foster Russian as the "second native language" of the non-Russian peoples, there is a long way to go. But its use as a secondary medium of communication is developed by the school system, and its practical currency is much wider than claims to fluency might suggest.

Pluralism does extend some little way beyond language to include literature and artistic and musical idioms, but certainly not indigenous value systems if they conflict with the official ones. For example, there is no question, of accepting the "traditional" Muslim view of the role of women just because (for whatever reason) it is part of the culture. There may be concession, like the not infrequent seating of boys and girls separately in class, or the retention of a few women's pedagogical schools; but these are tactical moves, not a sign of acceptance. Stalin's famous formulation about developing "a culture national in form but socialist in content" is significant here; the structure of the school system, and the value system it seeks to promote, are uniform and centrally determined; and if sometimes it is decided to hasten slowly, to try gradualism and persuasion rather than coercion, this is a question of the best means to the end, not a rejection of the end itself. Pluralism is of form, while the approach to content is unitary.

Constraints and Limitations in Practice

But policy thus defined is still constrained by practical problems of level of development and of numbers. Neither of these is much of a problem in the Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia or the Baltic Republic. All of these have well-established literary forms, and populations (even in the case of smaller groups like the Armenians or Estonians) sufficiently numerous and compact to make the full range of schooling in the vernacular a practical possibility. The Central Asian languages have had a more chequered career. Before the Revolution, some were not written at all, since the few people who were literate tended to use the related literary forms of Turkish or Persian or the unrelated Arabic. When many of the written languages were being developed after the Revolution, the Latin alphabet was used at first, then the transition was made to modified forms of the Cyrillic alphabet.[12]

But whether they have a written form or not, there comes a point where paucity of numbers limits the feasibility of full-scale vernacular schooling. Instruction in Georgian or Latvian or Uzbek or Ukrainian, from kindergarten to university, is quite a reasonable

expectation on practical as well as legal grounds, but is hardly possible for tiny groups like the Orochi, the Tofalar or the Selkup. In practice, there is a great deal of variety in the extent of vernacular schooling. The whole range is available in the languages of the Union Republics, though not always outside their own territories[13] The extent to which Russian is *used* varies from one Republic to another depending on other factors (we have already seen some of the differences between the Ukraine and Armenia), but at least it is a feasible proposition. For the rest, it is largely a matter of numbers. In the larger ASSRs, those with over 100,000 speakers per language, it is usually possible to offer the entire eight-year school, i.e., classes I — VIII of the General Educational School up to the end of the compulsory period of schooling. In the smaller ones, with over 10,000 speakers, the primary stage (classes I — III or IV) may be taught in the vernacular, the rest of the classes being given in Russian, or sometimes in another vernacular such as Georgian or Tadzhik, depending on the area. There is some evidence, not conclusive as yet, that the incompleteness of such vernacular schooling leads many parents to opt for Russian-medium schools on the grounds that the children will need it to complete their schooling anyway. (There are parallels in the West too). As for the very small groups, especially those with no written form, Russian has to be used throughout, the native tongue being employed only as an aid until the children have enough Russian to proceed. This requires special training. In the Herzen Pedagogic Institute in Leningrad, for example, the Northern Department admits small groups of students from certain northern nationalities and trains them specifically for the problems of teaching in their own areas, with special reference to the children's competence in Russian. What we seem to be faced with is a general policy of *linguistic* pluralism, as defined, within the practical constraints of numbers and developmental levels. It is now necessary to consider how the various peoples have fared scholastically, and to examine the implications of present trends for the USSR and for other societies also faced with the problem of reconciling unity and diversity.

Developments and Implications

If one examines the various nationalities' levels of scholastic attainment,[14] it is clear that there are substantial inequalities. Some of them are surprising. There are various cultural reasons why Jews in the RSFSR should be far ahead of the entire field, and it has been suggested — though there is little hard evidence — that the Georgians' position as clear second in the league is the result of Stalin's special favour to his fellow-countrymen.[15] If we take as a measure the proportions with higher education, we find the following groups above the USSR average: Jews in the RSFSR, an astonishing 39.9 per cent; Georgians, 10.5; Armenians, 7.5; Tatars in the Uzbek SSR, 6.8; Estonians, 6.0; Russians, 5.9; and Latvians, 5.6. Just below the average come the Azerbaidzhanis (5.3), the Yakuts (4.6) and the Lithuanians and Ukrainians (both 4.5 per cent). On the whole, the Central Asian Turkic peoples tend to score low (e.g. Chuvash, 2.4; Bashkir, 2.2); but so do the Moldavians (2.2). For those with complete secondary education, the pattern is similar but not identical. Once again, the Jews are far ahead (30.7), with the Georgians this time much closer (30.0), followed by the Armenians (23.5), Uzbek Tatars (21.1), Russians (19.7), Ukrainians (19.2), while the Latvians, Estonians and Azerbaidzhanis come in close under the national average. Among the major nationalities, the Moldavians once again bring up the rear.

Kravetz,[15] in his thorough examination of current trends, has analysed these figures in relation to the level of urbanisation (on the well established assumption that rural populations have disproportionately acute problems in the USSR) and the extent of fluency in Russian. Now, if we take the conspicuously most successful group, the Jews living in the RSFSR, we find them scoring very high on both counts: 97.9 per cent urban, and over 70 per cent with Russian as their *first* language. (There is no upper secondary or higher education in Yiddish anyway). Of the other above-average groups, the Russians are highly urbanized (68 per cent) and obviously use the Russian language; but after that the correlation begins to break down. The Tatars have a high incidence of fluency in Russian (81.2 per cent of the urban and 38 per cent of the rural population), but only a moderate level of urbanisation (55 per cent, below the USSR average). Armenians score high on urbanisation (64.8 per cent), but low on Russian fluency (31.6 per cent urban, 9.5 per cent rural), while Georgians score low on both criteria (44 per cent urban, of whom only 35.8 claim to be fluent in Russian). At the other end of the scale, the Moldavians have a high level of Russian fluency (62.2 per cent of the urban and 27.8 per cent of the rural population), but are overwhelmingly rural (79.6 per cent, one of the highest proportions in the USSR). The level of urbanisation does seem to be a useful guide in many cases, but the correlation is by no means close. As for the level of access to Russian, this seems to be a minor factor in many cases, but quite irrelevant in some. It is reasonable to assume that numerically less precise criteria, such as the strength of the indigenous cultures, carry more weight in determining educational advance.

The difficulty of attaching achievement to any particular criterion can be illustrated by comparing the major Central Asian nationalities. On the higher education measure, the Kazakhs lead with 4.2 per cent, and the Tadzhiks come at the end with 3.2; in between come the Kirgiz, Uzbeks and Turksmens. (See Table 7). Taking proportions with complete secondary schooling, we find the Uzbeks in the lead this time (16.2 per cent); the Kirgiz now come second, and the Kazakhs have fallen to third place, but the Tadzhiks have risen, leaving the Turksmens at the bottom with 13.6 — not a vast discrepancy, but considerably greater than that applying in higher education. Generally, the Uzbeks, Kirgiz and Kazakhs do relatively well for the area, the Turkmen and Tadzhiks worse; but the connection with the two criteria mentioned by Kravetz is not close. The Kazakhs are *relatively* urbanised (26.7 per cent), but the Tadzhiks come near (26.0 per cent), while the Turkmens are actually ahead (31.0 per cent). As for fluency in Russian, this is very high among the Kazakhs (59.5 per cent urban, 35.2 per cent rural), as might be expected in view of the high proportion of Russians in Kazakhstan; but the others come much lower (a little over 30 per cent). Finally, it has been suggested that the Uzbek and Tadzhik cultures are stronger and better developed than the rest. Thus, tentatively, one might suggest partial explanation for the relative success of the Kazakhs (urbanisation, use of Russian) and the Uzbeks (indigenous culture); but that is about as far as one can go. Explanations of any precision depend, it would appear, on combinations of factors, some of which are not fully understood as yet. For future work, much more information is needed, especially on the extent, use and *quality* of native-language instruction in the various republics.

The role of government policy, it has already been suggested, is necessarily limited, but it can account for developments that are difficult to link closely with such factors as urbanisation, the currency of Russian, or for that matter the strength of the cultures or the religious factor examined by the Halevys. The next Census should provide fuller in-

formation, but already there are indications that the relative positions of the groups are changing and that the gaps are narrowing. Kravetz has taken the Census of 1970 figures for higher education enrolment and compared them with 1976-77 (still a time of increase); these are given in Table 8. Most show an increase, some a spectacular one. The most striking increases are among the Central Asian peoples. Chuvash, Bashkirs, Tatars, Tadzhiks, Kazakhs and Kirgiz all have ratios of over 120; increases above the USSR average of 108 include the Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Uzbeks, Turkmens and the peoples of Dagestan. The Estonians are on the average, the Moldavians, Ukrainians and Russians just under it, and the Armenians well below. The Georgians show an actual, though small, decrease, and the Jews a substantial one, a cut of nearly 40 per cent of the 1970 figure.[17]

Admittedly, enrolment in higher education gives an incomplete picture of a group's educational advance (witness the discrepancies between proportions with higher and complete secondary education given in Table 4). But it is a useful indicator nevertheless. The improvement of the position of the Central Asian peoples is consistent enough to argue the existence of a deliberate policy of positive discrimination; and, since the expansion of higher education does not happen overnight, it can hardly be a simple matter of adjusting the enrolment quotas, but, rather, a further-reaching policy of intervention, including presumably a major diverson of resources. At the other end of the scale, discrimination against Jews and, to a lesser extent, Georgians is clear enough. The mechanism is clear also; increases may not be effected by the imposition of quotas, but reductions can — indeed, it is not easy to see how else they could be achieved. Most of the commentary so far has emphasized the declining position of Soviet Jews — not surprising, in view of their prominent participation in the educational system up to the present, and the deterioration of their social and political situation. Anti-Zionism there certainly is, anti-Semitism there may be; but once again this is not the whole story. Viewed as a whole, the figures strongly suggest attempts (with varying success) to reduce inequalities both by favouring the disadvantaged and pulling back the more advanced groups, by a variety of measures including the use of a quota system.

As far as language policy in the narrower sense is concerned, even if one discounts accusations of deliberate Russification, developments could take one of two roads. It is denied by the authorities that there is any intention of moving towards assimilation of the linguistic minorities, but there is a school of thought that talks of "convergence",[18] the eventual mingling of the Soviet peoples in one new language community. Isayev mentions the fact that large numbers of people have moved from their original homelands to live elsewhere in the USSR (omitting to mention that in many cases the move was hardly voluntary); and tends to encourage linguistic convergence. He cites instances of influences of Russian on the minority languages, and vice versa. Borrowing vocabulary is one thing, but changing basic grammatical structures quite another, and it is hard to see how "convergence" would really differ from assimilation into the Russian speech-community. It is obvious that prejudices can survive for a long time, and re-surface in ideologically "respectable" forms. "Convergence" could easily become a recipe for neo-chauvinism and, by reaction, its nationalist mirror-image too.

Genuine pluralism, linguistically at least, would seem the more viable option in the long run. Clearly, there are limits; we have seen how numbers, more than developmental levels, can limit the use of vernaculars. But, equally, it does appear that there are minorities with long-standing viable cultures, and others which have emerged from illiteracy to

full educational viability in the last half-century or so. At the level of *Realpolitik*, it is understandable that central authorities can become anxious about possible future fissiparous tendencies, especially in sensitive border areas; but, even in realistic terms, the temptation to solve this problem through covert Russification could be counter-productive. In the long run, a large multi-national state has to be run on a pluralist basis, or face the prospects of tensions of an increasingly serious kind.

The question of pluralism in content is a more difficult one, and is still unresolved. Strictly speaking, it falls outside the scope of this enquiry, but in practice language is but one aspect of a culture, not readily separable fom the others. In theory, the content of schooling in the USSR is informed by an overriding value system of Marxism-Leninism and Soviet Patriotism, which means that traditional attitudes towards women, for example, cannot be left to pass unchallenged, whether they are held by Tadzhiks or Russians. In practice, Soviet Patriotism contains a good deal of what looks to the naked eye like old-fashioned Russian patriotism, and the treatment of national figures in history, for example, invites contrast with the far more cautious handling of key figures among the minorities. Uzbek and Caucausian children are taught in their own languages, but not about such stalwarts of resistance to Tsarist expansion as Yarub Beg or Shamyl.[19] While appreciating anxieties about maintaining unity and cohesion, one must ask if genuine pluralism can stop at the language of instruction. This is always a difficult point for majorities to accept — minorities too, sometimes — but will have to be considered carefully if more dangerous forms of self-assertion are to be avoided.

The problems of reconciling cultural diversity and some kind of political unity are to be found far beyond the confines of the USSR. In Western Europe, for instance, we are all minorities now, and the passage of time makes it ever clearer that the either/or model does not work any more — French *or* European, Catalan *or* Spanish, Scots *or* British; increasingly, we are having to be aware of, and educated for, several levels of identity. The European Community has barely begun to work out the practicalities of cooperating pluralism yet, and that long-standing multi-national state, the United Kingdom, has hardly grasped the point either. The multinational groupings to which more and more of us belong need not be threatened by diversity, but can best be unified *through* it, as both are fundamental attributes of any human group. The concepts are not easy to formulate as policy, let alone to work out in practice, which is one reason why the experience of the Soviet Union, with its faults and limitations as well as its successes, must be of continuing interest in an increasingly multi-cultural yet shrinking world.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. See Table 1.
2. Moldavian is closely similar to the Romanian used across the frontier, but is written in the Cyrillic script.
3. The vast majority of Soviet Jews are Russian-speaking and know no Yiddish. This form of German, transcribed in the Hebrew alphabet, is offically used in the Jewish Autonomous Province of Birobidzhan.
4. For a fuller discussion of this question in relation to the USSR and the Third World, see N. Grant, 'Language and Education' in J. Lowe, N. Grant and T.D. Williams (eds.), *Education and Nation-Building in the Third World* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1977).
5. K.M. Musaev, *Alfavity yazykov narodov SSSR* (Moskva: Nauka, 1965).
6. Zvi Halevy and Eva Etsioni-Halevy, "The 'Religious Factor' and Achievement in Education", *Comparative Education*, Vol. 10, (No. 3, October 1974), pp. 193-200.

7. For a discussion of this question, see N. Grant, 'Sexual Equality in the Communist World', *Compare*
8. This is based on personal observations in Kiev and Erevan, February 1976.
9. For fuller discussion, see N. Grant, "Education for Multicultural Society", in T.C. Corner (ed.), *Education in Multicultural Societies: Conf. Proc. Comparative Education Society in Europe (British Section)*. (Edinburgh, 1978).
10. Details are given in Table 2.
11. Adapted from Isayev, pp. 253-254.
12. This was attacked in some quarters as an attempt to break links with the Islamic world and to Russify the Central Asian peoples. Even if this were the case, it can be argued that the Arabic alphabet, aesthetically beautiful though it is, is complex in its own right, and, being based on a consonantal system, adapts ill to the phonemically quite different Iranian and Turkic languages. This was also the view of Kemal Atatürk in Turkey, and his reason for switching to the Latin alphabet as a basis for mass literacy. From this point of view there is little to choose between Latin and Cyrillic, both (with Greek) alphabets of the same type.
13. There are about five million Ukrainians living in other parts of the USSR, some of whom complain that schooling in their own language is available only in the Ukrainian SSR itself, while Russians can be taught in their own language practically anywhere.
14. For details see Table 4.
15. It is possible, no doubt; but Stalin has been dead for a long time, and it is a moot point how far he thought of himself as a Georgian anyway. Also, there is ample evidence from the study of the Soviet educational system in general that governmental action can achieve relatively little if other factors are unfavourable.
16. He calls this the "ratio of linguistic Russification"; this is rather an unfortunate term, since the figures cited are of those claiming fluency in Russian as a *second* language. But, with that reservation, the figures have their uses. See Tables 5 and 6.
17. Ibid.
18. Isayev.
19. Yakub Beg and Shamyl, though much more recent, occupy places in Uzbek and Caucasian history and legend not unlike those of William Wallace in Scotland and Wilhelm Tell in Switzerland.

TABLE 1

Nationalities over 1 million, 1970.

		Thousands	*% of total*
	USSR	*241,720*	*100*
1.	Russians	129,015	53.4
2.	Ukrainians	40,753	16.9
3.	Uzbeks	9,195	3.8
4.	Byelorussians	9,052	3.7
5.	Tatars	5,931	2.5
6.	Kazakhs	5,299	2.2
7.	Azerbaidzhanis	4,380	1.8
8.	Armenians	3,559	1.5
9.	Georgians	3,245	1.3
10.	Moldavians	2,698	1.1
11.	Lithuanians	2,665	1.1
12.	Jews	2,151	0.9
13.	Tadzhiks	1,846	0.8
14.	Chuvash	1,694	0.7
15.	Turkmens	1,525	0.6
16.	Kirgiz	1,452	0.6
17.	Latvians	1,430	0.6
18.	Bashkirs	1,240	0.5
19.	Estonians	1,007	0.4

Over 130 nationalities are listed in the 1970 census. For full details of Soviet linguistic groups, see M.I. Isayev, *National Languages in the USSR: Problems and Solutions*, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977).

TABLE 2a

Birth, death and increase rates, per thousand, by Republics (1970).

Republic	*Birth rate*	*Death rate*	*Increase*
RSFSR	14.2	8.5	5.7
Ukraine	14.6	8.6	6.0
Byelorussia	15.9	7.4	8.5
Uzbekistan	32.7	5.9	26.8
Kazakhstan	23.5	6.2	17.3
Georgia	18.7	7.5	11.2
Azerbai'dzhan	29.3	7.0	22.3
Lithuania	17.4	8.7	8.7
Moldavia	18.9	7.4	11.5
Latvia	14.0	11.1	2.9
Kirgizia	30.1	7.5	22.6
Tadzhikistan	34.7	6.1	28.6
Armenia	22.8	5.2	17.6
Turkmenistan	34.3	7.0	27.3
Estonia	15.5	11.3	4.2

TABLE 2b

Increases in population, selected nationalities, 1959-1970. (millions)

	1959	*1970*
Russians	114	129
Ukrainians	37.3	40.8
Uzbeks	6.0	9.2
Byelorussians	7.9	9.1
Tatars	5.0	5.9
Kazakhs	3.6	5.3
Azerbaidzhanis	2.9	4.4
Armenians	2.8	3.6

TABLE 3

Small ethnic groups, by written languages used (after Isayev, adapted)

Written Languages	*Peoples*
1. *Far North and Siberia*	
Russian	Aleuts, Alyutor, Itelmen, Kets, Nganasans, Negidals, Oroks, Orochi, Saami, Tofa, Udege, Chulymus, Enets, Yukagir.
Tatar and Russian	Barabas, Kamasin.
Yakut and Russian	Dolgans.
Chukchi and Russian	Kereks
Russian and Khakas	Shors
2. *Caucasus*	
Avar and Russian	Audi, Archi, Akhvakh, Bagvlais, Bezhitas, Botlikhes, Ginukhos, Gunzils, Godoberi, Dido, Karati, Kisti, Tats (Dagestap), Tindi, Khvarshi, Chamali
Lezgin and Russian	Agul
Georgian	Bats, Svans
Georgian and Azerbaidzhani	Udi
Azerbaidzhani	Budukhes, Kryz, Khinalugs
Azerbaidzhani and Russian	Rutuls, Talysh, Tats (Azerbaidzhan),
Azerbaidzhani and Lezgin	Tsakhurs
Russian	Aisors
3. *Central Asia*	
Tadzhik	Oroshores, Yagnobes, Yazgulam
Tadzhik and Russian	Bartanges, Wakhi, Lahkashim, Rushan, Shugnes
Turkmen and Russian	Baluchi
Kazakh and Russian	Dungans
4. *Others*	
Russian	Vepsians, Izhorians
Russian and Lithuanian	Livonians
Ukrainian and Lithuanian	Karaimes

TABLE 4

Selected nationalities, 1970: proportions of population age 10 or over with higher education (HE), complete secondary schooling (CS), more than primary schooling (P+), primary only (P) and less than primary schooling (P−).

	HE	*CS*	*P+*	*P*	*P−*
USSR	5.5	18.7	48.3	29.3	22.4
Russians	5.9	19.7	50.8	28.9	20.3
Ukrainians	4.5	19.2	47.6	28.3	24.1
Byelorussians	4.0	16.9	43.8	33.3	22.9
Estonians	6.0	18.2	46.2	43.7	10.1
Latvians	5.6	18.3	48.8	32.1	19.1
Lithuanians	4.5	11.9	35.3	38.5	26.1
Moldavians	2.2	8.6	33.8	34.3	31.9
Armenians	7.5	23.5	51.8	27.1	21.1
Georgians	10.5	30.0	57.8	23.6	18.6
Azerbaidzhanis	5.3	17.3	42.4	28.9	28.7
Uzbeks	3.7	16.2	41.2	28.0	30.8
Kazakhs	4.2	14.9	39.0	29.9	31.1
Kirgiz	3.8	15.2	40.0	28.5	31.5
Tadzhiks	3.2	13.8	39.0	29.6	31.4
Turkmens	3.6	13.6	43.0	27.9	29.1
Bashkirs	2.2	10.2	36.9	35.7	27.4
Chuvash	2.4	11.9	42.4	32.3	25.3
Jews (RSFSR)	39.9	30.7	82.4	11.6	6.0
Tatars (RSFSR)	3.1	13.2	44.2	31.8	24.0
Tatars (Uzbek SSR)	6.8	21.1	53.5	27.4	18.8
Yakuts	4.6	14.3	37.4	32.0	30.6

TABLE 5

Urban-rural Distribution by nationality, 1970.

Nationality	*% Urban*	*% Rural*
USSR average	*56.0*	*44.0*
1. Jews	97.9	2.1
2. Russians	68.0	32.0
3. Armenians	64.8	35.2
4. Estonians	55.1	44.9
5. Tatars	55.0	45.0
6. Latvians	52.7	47.3
7. Ukrainians	48.5	51.5
8. Lithuanians	46.7	53.3
9. Georgians	44.0	56.0
10. Byelorussians	43.7	56.3
11. Azerbaidzhanis	39.7	60.3
12. Turkmens	31.0	69.0
13. Kazakhs	26.7	73.3
14. Tadzhiks	26.0	74.0
15. Uzbeks	24.9	75.1
16. Moldavians	20.4	79.6
17. Kirgiz	14.6	85.4

TABLE 6

Percentage of selected nationalities claiming fluency in Russian as second language, 1970.

Nationality	*Rural*	*Urban*
Ukrainians	25.1	58.5
Bylorussians	50.1	55.9
Moldavian	27.8	62.2
Lithuanians	21.8	51.1
Latvians	37.8	52.4
(Latvians, Russian as first language)	0.6	13.7
Estonians	16.7	36.5
Kazakhs	35.2	59.5
Uzbeks	6.9	32.0
Tadzhiks	10.6	33.7
Turkmens	7.4	30.7
Azerbaidzhanis	4.3	29.6
Georgians	8.2	35.6
Armenians	9.5	31.6
Tatars	38.0	81.2
Jews (Russian 1st, no Yiddish)	56.9	72.8
Jews (Yiddish 1st language)	17.6	14.2

TABLE 7

Central Asia, major nationalities: educational attainment, urbanisation and currency of fluent Russian compared.

% with Higher Ed.		*% with Complete Soc.*			*% urban*		*% with fluent Russian (urban)*
1. Kazakhs	4.2	Uzbeks	16.2	Turkmens	31.0	Kazakhs	59.5
2. Kirgiz	3.8	Kirgiz	15.2	Kazakhs	26.7	Tadzhiks	33.7
3. Uzbeks	3.7	Kazakhs	14.9	Tadzhiks	26.0	Uzbeks	32.0
4. Turkmens	3.6	Tudzhiks	13.8	Uzbeks	24.9	Turkmens	30.7
5. Takzhiks	3.2	Turkmens	13.6	Kirgiz	14.6	Kirgiz	?

TABLE 8

Higher Education Students (undergraduate) by nationality

	1970-71		*1976-77*		% *1976-7/1970-1*
USSR	4,580.6	100.0	4,950.2	100.0	108
Russians	2,729.0	59.6	2,926.1	59.1	107
Ukrainians	621.2	13.6	655.1	13.4	107
Byelorussians	131.2	2.9	155.3	3.1	118
Uzbeks	150.7	3.3	176.5	3.6	117
Kazakhs	100.3	2.2	124.0	2.5	124
Georgians	87.8	1.9	82.6	1.7	94
Azerbaidzhanis	86.0	1.9	90.8	1.8	106
Lithuanians	49.8	1.1	58.6	1.2	118
Moldavians	30.8	0.7	33.0	0.7	107
Latvians	21.8	0.5	24.1	0.5	111
Kirgiz	26.4	0.6	32.1	0.6	122
Tadzhiks	28.1	0.6	34.7	0.7	124
Armenians	81.5	1.8	82.1	1.7	101
Turkmens	22.0	0.5	24.9	0.5	114
Estonians	17.9	0.4	19.3	0.4	108
Bashkirs	14.8	0.3	18.9	0.4	128
Dagestan peoples	20.3	0.4	23.8	0.5	117
Tatars	87.0	1.9	108.2	2.2	125
Chuvash	16.0	0.3	20.6	0.4	129
Jews	105.8	2.3	66.9	1.4	63
Others	152.2	3.3	182.6	3.7	120

TABLE 9

Graduate students, by nationality

	End 1970		End 1975		% 1978/80
Total USSR	99,427	100.0	95,675	100.0	96
Russians	59,517	59.9	59,120	61.8	99
Ukrainians	12,248	12.3	11,863	12.4	97
Byelorussians	2,540	2.6	2,634	2.8	103
Uzbeks	2,493	2.5	2,628	2.7	105
Kazakhs	1,780	1.8	2,011	2.1	113
Georgians	1,846	1.9	1,638	1.7	89
Azerbaidzhanis	2,036	2.0	1,820	1.9	89
Lithuanians	1,195	1.2	1,056	1.1	88
Moldavians	619	0.6	565	0.6	91
Latvians	700	0.7	615	0.6	88
Kirgiz	452	0.5	446	0.5	99
Tadzhiks	489	0.5	502	0.5	103
Armenians	2,292	2.3	2,036	2.1	89
Turkmens	480	0.5	450	0.5	94
Estonians	657	0.7	480	0.5	73
Bashkirs	236	0.2	259	0.3	109
Dagestan peoples	528	0.5	499	0.5	95
Tatars	1,380	1.4	1,419	1.5	103
Chuvash	267	0.3	247	0.3	93
Jews	4,945	5.0	2,841	3.0	57
Other	2,727	2.8	2,546	2.1	93

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Nigel Grant is a Professor of Education at the University of Glasgow. He is the author of the excellent book *Soviet Education*, published in 1964 by the Penguin Books and of *Society, Schools and Progress in Eastern Europe*, published by the Pergammon Press in 1969, in the well-known series "Society, Schools and Progess", edited by Edmund King. Professor Grant has also written for scholarly journals and presented numerous papers at national and international conferences of learned societies. He has travelled, researched, lectured, and visited schools in many countries, including the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Ireland, Germany, Scandinavia and all the countries of Eastern Europe except Albania. His other interests include poetry, painting, natural history and linguistics.

Michel Laferrière est sociologue de formation. Il a fait ses études en France (Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, et Université de Paris-Sorbonne) et aux Etats Unis (Columbia University). Il enseigne depuis 1974 à la Faculté des Sciences de l'Education de l'Université McGill et y dirige le Projet de Recherche F.C.A.C. sur l'Education des Minorités. Ses recherches portent sur l'éducation des immigrants et des minorités, l'inégalité et l'éducation, et la sociologie des sciences sociales.

Sister Anne Leonard received her early education in Ontario and Quebec. She received her B.A. from the University of Toronto, St. Michael's College; her M.A. in English from San Francisco College for Women; a B.Ed. in English and Mathematics from the University of Manitoba; a M.Ed. in Curriculum Theory from the University of British Columbia. She received her Teachers' Training in Albany, New York and has taught in Quebec, Manitoba, British Columbia and Nova Scotia. She worked with the English Curriculum Committee in Manitoba; with the English Teachers' Educational Project for developing Guides for Canadian Literature; with the Education Committee of the Multicultural Society of British Columbia. She has conducted workshops on the teaching of Canadian Literature and submitted articles to *The English Teachers' Journals* of Manitoba and British Columbia. She is presently teaching in the High School, Convent of the Sacred Heart operated by her religious order with schools around the world.

An Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto, *Vandra Lea Masemann* is currently writing up the results of her recent research on bilingual classrooms in Milwaukee. She has conducted ethnographic research on schooling in West Africa, and evaluation research in Ontario. An anthropologist, she is interested in cross-cultural, bilingual and comparative education. She has taught at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. She has published in the *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, *Interchange*, the *International Review of Education*, and the *Comparative Education Review*.

Professor *Werner Stephan* received most of his education in Berlin, Germany. He taught at a high school in East Berlin and later at elementary and high schools in West Germany. After immigrating to Canada he obtained his M.A. in Comparative Education from the University of Calgary and his Ph.D. in History of Education and Comparative Education from the University of Alberta. He has published articles on multicultural education in German educational journals and recently chaired the panel on multicultural education at the Second World Congress on Soviet and East European Studies in Garmisch, Germany. At the present time he is an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Foundations, University of Saskatchewan.

Keith A. McLeod is a member of the Department of History, Philosophy, and Sociology at the Faculty of Education, University of Toronto. He was a Visiting Professor in Multiculturalism at the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba in 1976-77. He is the founding editor of the journal *Multiculturalism*, a member of the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism and Citizenship, and the author of many articles on ethnic studies and multicultural education.

Canadian Society for the Study of Education
Société canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation

The society fosters research and scholarly studies in education. Its members come from universities, research institutes, school systems and government offices across Canada. Through the Society, they share their approaches to educational problems in Canadian life and experience. The Society also works to increase contacts with scholars abroad and to ensure an exchange of information and ideas with them.

The Society publishes scholarly work through its official journal, the *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation* and through a yearbook which focuses on current issues in education. Membership in the Society is open to all who support its aims. Manuscripts for publication are invited from educational scholars everywhere.

La Société encourage la recherche et les études avancées dans le domaine de l'éducation. Ses membres viennent d'universités, d'instituts de recherche, de commissions scolaires et de bureaux gouvernementaux à travers le pays. Par l'entremise de la Société, ils échangent leurs vues et approches aux questions éducatives dans le contexte de la vie et de l'expérience canadienne. La Société travaille aussi à resserrer les liens entre ses membres et les savants étrangers, ainsi qu'à promouvoir un échange d'information entre eux.

La Société publie des ouvrages savants dans sa revue officielle, la *Revue canadienne de l'éducation/Canadian Journal of Education* et dans son Annuaire qui traite des questions de l'heure en éducation. Toute personne appuyant les buts de la Société peut en devenir membre. Tout érudit oeuvrant dans le domaine de l'éducation peut présenter ses manuscrits pour publication.

Abonnement/Subscriptions

Annuaire/Yearbook	$ 8.00
Revue canadienne de l'éducation/ Canadian Journal of Education 4 numéros par an/4 issues per year	24.00
Prix du numéro/Price per issue	6.00

Le paiement doit accompagner toute commande de moins de $12.00

Payment must accompany orders valued at $12.00 or less.

Les demandes d'abonnements et de renseignements sur les cotisations de membre doivent être adressées à:

Société canadienne pour l'étude
de l'éducation
Faculté de l'Education
Université de Colombié Britannique
Vancouver, Canada. V6T 1W5

Canadian Society for the
Study of Education
Faculty of Education
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada. V6T 1W5

CANADIAN SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION
SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE POUR L'ÉTUDE DE L'ÉDUCATION

Officers of the Society, 1981/Directeurs de la Société, 1981

Officers of the Society/Directeurs de la Société

Robin Farquhar (Saskatchewan) President/Président

Graham Kelsey (British Columbia) First vice-president/Vice-président

Gilles Nadeau (Moncton) Second vice-president/Vice-président-adjoint

Glen Aikenhead (Saskatchewan) Secretary-Treasurer/Secrétaire-trésorier

Naomi Hersom (British Columbia) Past president/Président sortant

Affiliated Associations/Les associations affiliées

Canadian Association of Teacher Education/Association canadienne des professeurs d'éducation
G. Clarke (New Brunswick) President/Président

Canadian Educational Researchers Association/Association canadienne des chercheurs en éducation
W.T. Rogers (University of British Columbia) President/Président

Canadian Association of Foundations of Education/Association canadienne pour l'étude des fondements de l'éducation
M. Elliott (British Columbia) President/Président

Canadian Association of Deans of Education/Association canadienne des doyens d'éducation
D. MacIver (New Brunswick) President/Président

Comparative and International Education Society of Canada/Société canadienne d'éducation comparée et internationale
S. Kong (Toronto) President/Président

Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies/Association canadienne pour l'étude du curriculum
Keith Leithwood (OISE) President/Président

Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration/Association canadienne pour l'étude de l'administration scolaire
P. Coleman (Simon Fraser) President/Président

Canadian Association for Educational Psychology/Association canadienne pour l'étude de la psychopédagogie
C. Anderson (Alberta) President/Président